

MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- MSATS Procedures – WIGS
- MSATS Procedures – CATS
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline
- Retail Electricity Market Procedures
Glossary & Framework

CONSULTATION – Draft Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Ausgrid

Completion Date: 5 June 2020

Table of Contents

- 1. Context 3
- 2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Issues Paper 3
- 3. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline 12
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 15

1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback to the questions raised in the Draft Report about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data.

2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Draft Report

2.1 Material Issues

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Type 4a Metering Installation (MRAM) Reason	1.	What are the key issues for AEMO to consider in working with stakeholders to explore with the AEMC the potential benefits of enhanced access to exception information?	No Comment.
Metering Installation Transformer Information	2.	In the cases where transformers have dual secondary windings or more (500kV : 110V : 110V), how would participants prefer to see those represented in the enumerated list for VT Ratio, keeping in mind that a transformer can have up to five secondary windings?	<p>Ausgrid notes AEMO's acceptance of certain NMI Classification Codes (BULK, XBOUNDARY and INTERCON) not requiring CT and VT details to be published in MSATS. If these changes are applied before 5MS goes live, NMIs with a NMI Classification of WHOLESAL and INTERCON should not be required to publish this information to MSATS.</p> <p>Some HV CTs are not of a specific type (e.g. S, T, W etc), how do participants identify these, by "Other"? In addition, HV CT could have a number of different ratios and secondary</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			<p>currents (1 A and 5 A), e.g. 400/600/800/1200:1. Is having this enumerated list limiting the accurate recording of the CT. Ausgrid notes that CT Accuracy class does not include class 0.2.</p> <p>Would it be better to have CT/VT Primary (voltage/current) field and CT/VT secondary (voltage/current) field?</p> <p>Would it be better to capture the majority of sites (i.e. LVCT) and have alternate information for the more complex configurations (ie. exclude HV sites).</p> <p>Ausgrid is of the opinion that this information should be stored in the MPs system not in MSATS, we do not see the value of storing this level of detail in MSATS.</p>
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	<p>The LNSP can populate the data, but Ausgrid suggest that the MP is also allowed to populate and maintain it as well. Once the MP installs the meter the shared fuse issue for that NMI would be resolved (only for any future works on that NMI), so Ausgrid see no reason for the MP to notify the LNSP.</p> <p>How does AEMO propose to identify sites where a shared fuse has been rectified on a</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			<p>particular NMI, but is still connected to a shared fuse scenario? (i.e. Flat 1 and Flat 2 are shared fuses, flat 1 meter is replaced and individual isolation provided (MC removes shared fuse flag in MSATS?), however if meter is required to be installed on flat 2, flat 1 will also have another outage).</p> <p>One potential solution could be to have a shared fuse flag on a NMI which indicates that there is no individual isolation for meters associated with that NMI. A second field would be required to "group" all associated NMIs associated with the shared isolation device, this could be just "grouping ID". This information would need to be made available via NMI discovery. If a report could be run on the Group ID and all of the individual shared fuse flags removed, then it could be determined that all sites can be individually isolated and the shared fuse problem has been resolved.</p>
GPS Coordinates	4.	Please explain the benefits for expanding the GPS coordinates field to cover all NMIs given this would be a significant cost? For example, some multi-floor buildings would have the same GPS coordinates so you may also need	Ausgrid is of the opinion that in a significant number of circumstances in urban areas, GPS co-ordinates will not be able to be accurately obtained (e.g. meters inside with no satellite signal), what would the expectation be in this circumstance, last recorded GPS co-ordinate,

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?	<p>estimated coordinate? A description of meter location would provide a better chance to find the meter in these circumstances.</p> <p>Ausgrid does see a benefit of the provision of GPS coordinates in rural properties, but would like to highlight that GPS co-ordinates in a country town would have similar issues to urban environment, where accurate capture may not be available.</p> <p>Provision of this information on NMIs with a NMI Classification Codes (BULK, XBOUNDRY and INTERCON) should not be required to be published in MSATS. If these changes are applied before 5MS goes live, NMIs with a NMI Classification of WHOLESAL and INTERCON should not be required to publish this information to MSATS.</p>
	5.	AEMO has applied the definition of rural using the 'Designated regional area postcodes' to gain consistency in approach, however feedback indicates a mixed response to this option. Is there an alternate NEM wide definition that can be applied across the NEM? AEMO notes, for example, in Queensland NMIs are required to be classified as urban, short rural and long rural for Guaranteed Service Levels. Is there	<p>Can AEMO investigate as to whether council zoning definitions can be imported into MSATS and use to determine if the site is rural?</p> <p>Ausgrid highlighted in its initial submission that using post codes does not achieve the intent of what AEMO is attempting to achieve (i.e. the country town scenario where the town will have</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		something similar to this in other jurisdictions and can it be applied there?	the same post code as the out lying rural properties?
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	No, given the cost to capture potentially inaccurate information, Ausgrid suggest that this field should be required not mandatory. Agree for rural installations, new and replacement where an accurate GPS coordinate can be obtained.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	Meter location and hazard codes are what Ausgrid stores as network information. Ausgrid would not want MPs deleting this information and updating with their own information and vice versa.
	8.	Are there other fields that may be suitable to apply this information? For example, Meter Location field with an increased character length available for the field.	
	9.	Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field?	Ausgrid has no strong opinion on this field so long as if it is included it cannot be overwritten by other parties. Networks can store data relevant to the network, in network systems, it does not necessiary need to be stored in MSATS.

2.2 Data Transition

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Scenarios	10.	For Removed fields, would you prefer Option 1 (retain history) or Option 2 (remove history)?	Option 2.
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	Option 4
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	No Comment
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	No Comment
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	No Comment
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	Ausgrid would support bulk update with notifications.
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	Option 4.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	17.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	No Comment
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	No Comment
	19.	Please provide any further details required	Ausgrid would support bulk update with notifications.
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	Option 1
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	No Comment

2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	No, customer related information should not be stored in MSATS.
	23.	What types of scenarios – including specific examples – could be envisaged which would raise complexities whose resolution would be required in order to achieve the data sharing objectives?	No, customer related information should not be stored in MSATS.
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	No, customer related information should not be stored in MSATS.
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	No, customer related information should not be stored in MSATS.
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	No, customer related information should not be stored in MSATS.
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	<p>Ausgrid argued in the POC changes that the LNSP should allocate the NTC and the MP should provide the “meter use” so the LNSP could determine which tariff to allocate, this was not accepted.</p> <p>Ausgrid has built validation in its system to allocate NTC if they are incorrectly populated by the MP. The investment in this system is working correctly and we would not support any</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			change which requires Ausgrid to rebuild its NTC allocation system.
	28.	<p>If AEMO was to review the obligations on NTC, out of the options proposed, which do you see being the most effective to address the current issues experienced. Please provide reasons as to why you think the options you've chosen would address the issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Compliance options for MPB performance for incorrectly populating NTC b) Retailer obligations to inform the MC and MPB of the appropriate NTC c) Network obligations to correct an incorrectly populated NTC within three business days; and or d) If networks are provided the obligation to populate NTC then they will have only three business days to correctly populate this after the metering installation details are provided by the MPB, this will ensure there are not additional delays to the commissioning of the meter in MSATS 	<p>As Ausgrid has built validation in its system to allocate NTC if they are incorrectly populated by the MP. The situations described would be validated and updated by Ausgrid NTC allocation system.</p> <p>Ausgrid would not support any change which requires Ausgrid to rebuild its NTC allocation system.</p>
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	See above.

3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
General	Provision of the majority of this information should not be required to be published in MSATS on NMIs with a NMI Classification Codes (BULK, XBOUNDARY and INTERCON). If these changes are applied before 5MS goes live, NMIs with a NMI Classification of WHOLESAL and INTERCON should not be required to publish this information to MSATS.

4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Section 4.9	Ausgrid notes that Section and DP numbers will be required and not mandatory. Ausgrid agrees with this proposal as we do not use all of this information for NMI allocation and address setup.
Section 5.1.3	Solar/PV should be removed from meter use field.
Section 5.2	Business should be removed from the Time of day values.
Section 5.4	Ausgrid would like to query why the NSRD should be published for Type 7 NMIs as this is calculated data and not scheduled to be read.

5. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

6. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
General	Provision of the majority of this information should not be required to be published in MSATS on NMIs with a NMI Classification Codes (BULK, XBOUNDARY and INTERCON). If these changes are applied before 5MS goes live, NMIs with a NMI Classification of WHOLESAL and INTERCON should not be required to publish this information to MSATS.