

METERING ICF PACKAGE CHANGES

PROCEDURE CONSULTATION

FIRST STAGE PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: PLUS ES

Submission Date: 11 Sept 2020

Table of Contents

- 1. Context 3
- 2. MSATS Procedures: CATS 3
- 3. MSATS Procedures: WIGS 4
- 4. Metrology Procedure: Part A 5
- 5. Metrology Procedure: Part B 5
- 6. Service Level Procedure Meter Provider Services 6
- 7. NEM RoLR Processes Part A and Part B 6
- 8. Meter Data File Format Specification 7
- 9. Standing Data for MSATS 8
- 10. Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework 8
- 11. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter 9

1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback about the changes detailed in the initial draft procedures associated with the Metering ICF Package Changes consultation.

The changes being proposed are because of NER rule changes which have occurred requiring changes to AEMO’s Retail Electricity Market Procedures and the following proposed changes by proponents and AEMO to implement recommended process improvements.

2. MSATS Procedures: CATS

Section	Description	Participant Comments
2.4.(s)	Updated to include a new sub clause(s) for obligation on MDP to provide relationship mapping between Register ID and Datastream Suffix.	PLUS ES proposes that further clarification is provided for this obligation, with respect to MDPs providing relationship mapping between the Register ID and Datastream Suffix.
2.7	(refer to section 013.6).	Typo; references section 0.
2.9.(k)	Updated to include a different timeframe for cancelling an incomplete CR6800.	<p>PLUS ES support the increase in the timeframe for cancelling an incomplete CR6800.</p> <p>The statement in the issue paper is a generalisation and potentially incorrect.</p> <p><i>However, with respect to CR6800 transactions specifically, this means that the 220 days automatic cancellation will cancel the EOL work order in the MC’s systems which in turn cancels the service order back to the retailer.</i></p>

Section	Description	Participant Comments
		It depends on the participant's processes. For example, the MC could raise another CR6800, if the same MPB were to be nominated in the role. No non-compliance to maintain the B2B SO nor is it required to NOT Complete the SO to the retailer.
4.3 Table 4-C	Updated 'Description' for Code 'BADPARTY' for current MC to object to change of MC for SMALL NMI's only in Victoria.	
4.4 Table 4-D	Updated to reflect the current jurisdictional requirements for Small and Large customers.	
13.3.6 Table 13-H	New entry related to objection code 'BADPARTY' for CR6300 and CR6301.	

3. MSATS Procedures: WIGS

Section	Description	Participant Comments
Version	Updated to align version numbering with MSATS: CATS procedures	

4. Metrology Procedure: Part A

Section	Description	Participant Comments
12.5	Update to replace 'verification' with 'Validation'. Amend the section heading and introduction paragraph to better align with terminology used in SLP MP clause 4.2(b)	

5. Metrology Procedure: Part B

Section	Description	Participant Comments
2.4	Update to remove 'N' Metering Data Quality Flag	
13.2.2(a)(v)	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	
13.3.2(a)(ii)	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	
13.5.2(a)(v)	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	

6. Service Level Procedure Meter Provider Services

Section	Description	Participant Comments
4.2(a)(iii) & (b)	Update to replace 'verification' with 'Validation'.	
4.2(c)(ii) & (d)	Update to replace 'verify' with 'Validate'.	
4.4	Update to replace 'verify' with 'confirm'.	

7. NEM RoLR Processes Part A and Part B

Section	Description	Participant Comments
17.2(a)	Updated to change the section from 19 to 16.	
17.2(b)	Updated to include 'AEMO must' in the sub clause.	
17.2(c)	Include new sub clause to remove MSATS access for the Failed Retailer.	

8. Meter Data File Format Specification

Section	Description	Participant Comments
3.3.1(b)	Updated to remove the sub clause (b).	
4.4	<p>Updated to remove the text in Definition column related to Meter Data Quality Flag 'N' against the Field InternalValue1....InternalValueN</p> <p>Updated to remove 'N' from Allowed Values against the Fields QualityMethod and ReasonCode</p> <p>Updated to remove the text in Definition column related to Quality Flag 'N' against Field UpdateDateTime</p>	
4.5	Updated to remove 'N' from Allowed Values against the Fields QualityMethod and ReasonCode	
Appendix C	Update to remove the row related to Quality flag 'N'.	

9. Standing Data for MSATS

Section	Description	Participant Comments
8.1	Amend the description of Average Daily Load in Table 15	
9.1	Amend the description of RegisterID in Table 18	

10. Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework

Section	Description	Participant Comments
5	Amend definition of the term Average Daily Load (ADL).	

11. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
<p>Are there better options to accommodate the change proposals, that better achieve the required objectives? What are the pros and cons of these options? How would they be implemented?</p>	<p><u>Amend or Revert Definition of the Register ID Field in MSATS (ICF 029)</u></p> <p>To revert to what was in place prior to the 5MS changes, the Suffix ID description needs to be amended. With the current Suffix ID wording, the amendment to the Register ID description has effected no change. That is, the Suffix ID must equal to the NMISuffix in MDFF and the Suffix ID must equal Register ID.</p> <p>PLUS ES propose the following for the Suffix description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of the 2 dot points would suffice to achieve the intended outcome. • If further clarity is required, the following wording could replace the dots points: <i>The Suffix in the CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER table need not match the Register ID in the CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER table.</i> <p>Additionally the wording and requirements stated in the issues paper for this topic need to be revised and amended accordingly. i.e. ...<i>MSPs to do the following: Re-program their meter fleet to reflect the values of the NMI Suffix, which already has its own distinct field in MSATS.</i></p> <p>Furthermore, the link needs to be clarified between the MDFF and Meter Register table if the RegisterID is no longer the link.</p>
<p>What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?</p>	<p><u>Increase CR68xx Timeframe:</u></p> <p>The increase in CR68xx timeframe will increase the number of duplicate transactions. PLUS ES ask for the market to automatically cancel duplicate CR68xx transactions (Similar to CR10xx logic) where:</p>

Heading	Participant Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Same MC has two concurrent CR68xx• Upon change of MC a previous MC still has a CR68xx – validation that the CR68XX is associated to current participants in the role.• Two CR68xx nominates two different Parties in the same Role<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ MDP○ MPB○ MPC <p>It is suggested that the latest CR68xx from the current MC should remain where 2 or more CR68xx exist on the same NMI.</p>