

## 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:*** *Intellihub*

***Completion Date:*** *3<sup>rd</sup> 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 ..... 10
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 13

## 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?	<p>AEMO should allow MRAM no signal exemptions to be processed via the portal as well creating a one stop shop. It seems only MALFNCTIONS are included in this change.</p> <p>MRAM no signal sites require an exemption so participants would know it's a No Signal site as exemptions are not required for Customer opt Out.</p> <p>This would negate the need for a reason to be populated in MSATS as the exemption info would be available for No Signal and other MRAMs would obviously be Customer opt Out.</p> <p>Even though there is no obligation on the MC to notify participants when an MRAM No Signal has been granted it is proposed that MSATS</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			still notifies the existence of an exemption to participants in these instances and this will align the exemption process to MALFUNCTIONS.
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?	No preference.
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	Via a Site Access Notification to the LNSP with the details 'Shared Fuse'. I believe the B2B procedures allow the MC to raise these.
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 to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?	GPS coordinates are generally more of value in the rural sense.
	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	Not sure.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		something similar to this in other jurisdictions and can it be applied there?	
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	Agree with AEMOs proposal ro make GPS coordinates mandatory after 12 months and the obligation must be placed on whoever the current MPB is at the time, wether it is a contestable MPB or an LNSP.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	Not used by us.
	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.	Possibly.
	9.	Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field?	Cannot see the value at the moment.

## 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?	2a
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	i(a) receipt of notifications are preferred.
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	N/A
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	N/A
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	N/A
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	2a

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.	i(a)
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	N/A
	19.	Please provide any further details required	N/A
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	1
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	Not specifically.

## 2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	N/A
	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?	N/A
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	N/A
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	N/A
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	N/A
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	No issues other than the LNSPs questioning the MPB when they should be approaching the FRMP as per the procedures.
	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> <p>a) Compliance options for MPB performance for incorrectly populating NTC</p>	MPB's are not responsible for Network Tariffs hence the name and there should be no obligation placed on an MPB in relation to these.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		<p>b) Retailer obligations to inform the MC and MPB of the appropriate NTC</p> <p>c) Network obligations to correct an incorrectly populated NTC within three business days; and or</p> <p>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>	<p>The MSATS Procedures make it clear, the LNSPs and FRMPs need to sort it out in relation to Network Tariffs.</p> <p>The FRMPs are to provide the MPB with the correct NTC and the LNSPs need to update them if needed. The obligations should sit with FRMP and LNSP as it does today.</p> <p>Option 2 should be adopted which would be to de couple the network tariff as part of the metering information and place it at the NMI level.</p> <p>If this is not possible then allow metering updates to happen but make the network tariff field Optional so the MPB does not have to populate this and their metering CR will not reject, then placing the obligation on the LNSP to update the tariff as per point d).</p>
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	No.

### 3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
N/A	N/A

## 4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
4.3.2 Proposed validations for transformer information fields	The CT Ratio validations appear to be based on standard LVCT Types (i.e. A,B,C,S,T,U,V,W), but the list does not allow for HV CT's and LV Special CT's. There are a range of other single-tap and multi-tap ratios missing from this list.
CT Type	Suggest adding "LV Special" and "HV" to this list (as per previous comment).
VT Type	What are the benefit from this information? I would suggest "Single-Phase" and "Multi-Phase".
4.3.3 The addition of new transformer fields	"CT Test and VT Test" What is the purpose of these fields? "VT Sample Family ID" Not aware of sample testing of VT's. What is the purpose of this field?

## 5. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
N/A	N/A

## 6. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
N/A	N/A