

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: SA Power Networks

Completion Date: 2/06/2020

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?	
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?	
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	<p>There is currently no efficient way for this information to be shared.</p> <p>SA Power Networks would recommend that this be tackled in 2 stages –</p> <p>Stage 1 – Industry develop and agree a formal template that would be used to provide this</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			<p>information – with manual processes also developed and agreed to support the exchange of this information.</p> <p>Stage 2 (12 months after stage 1) - Validation of the information being shared to determine if the content is valid and suitable – with modifications being made where required. Assessment of volumes and use to determine if a formal systems base transaction is required and justifiable to exchange this information.</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 to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?	SA Power Networks is not able to quantify the benefits but would support GPS coordinates being provided at all NMI's when they are available (this should not be a mandatory requirement).
	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	SA Power Networks recommends the inclusion of wording that provides allowances for the exclusion of major regional centres/townships that would fall within the post code areas. These towns should be viewed in the same way that metropolitan suburbs and therefore flexibility is needed by industry.

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.	SA Power Network agree with AEMO's proposal.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	SA Power Networks have not identified a use for this field/information.
	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?	

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)?	SA Power Networks support option 1.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	SA Power Networks support option 4.
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	NA
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	NA
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	NA
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	NA
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	SA Power Networks support option 4.
	17.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	NA
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	NA

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	19.	Please provide any further details required	NA
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	SA Power Networks support option 2.
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	No.

2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	
	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?	
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	SA Power Networks continue to see issues with the population of the NTC due to involvement of parties outside of the LNSP – these occur on a regular basis.
	28.	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.	SA Power Networks would support a solution that enables the current NTC within MSATS to remain in place and prevents the MP from making changes at the time of completing metering updates within MSATS. In a number of

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		<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>cases, a change in metering will not trigger a change to the current NTC.</p> <p>When process the metering updates within internal system the LNSP can determine whether the tariff needs updating and process the required change at this time. Arrival of all required information/transactions (B2B Notice of Meter Works and MSATS CR) from the MP is required to complete the updates within the LNSP's systems and therefore, timeframes to make any changes to the NTC should not be placed on the LNSP given the dependency on information that is outside the LNSP's control.</p>
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	See comments to Q28

3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

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
DPID & G-NAF	SA Power Network support the use of G-NAF over the use of DPID.
Unstructured Address	<p>SA Power Networks continues to support the removal of unstructured address information, however, as previously stated, flexibility in this area is still required particularly for NMI's linked to unmetered supplies (both Type 7 and Non-Contestable UMS) which in most cases, are not located on a specific parcel of land – which restricts the ability to provide a structured address.</p> <p>There is also some historical data which also will need the unstructured address to remain in place until further work can be completed to identify the correct structured address.</p>