

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

## CONSULTATION – First Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

*Participant: Aurora Energy*

*Completion Date: 27/03/2020*

# 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 ..... 11
- 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 issues paper about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data.

## 2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Issues Paper

### 2.1 Metering Installation Information

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
General Metering Installation Information	1.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Number field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Aurora Energy supports the additional field
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Aurora Energy supports the additional field
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	Aurora Energy supports AEMO's comments
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	N/A

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disconnection Method</li> <li>• Meter Commission Date</li> <li>• Meter Family Failure (only if exemption no &amp; expiry are not used)</li> </ul>
	6.	<p>There are several existing fields that AEMO proposes removing from MSATS Standing Data. Do you see any value in their retention for the market? If so, please outline it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meter Constant may be a relevant field for older equipment as it refers to intrinsic constraint of meter in Wh/pulse. Is there value to this field for the market and if so is there another field that the constant could be listed in?</li> </ul>	Aurora Energy does not use the Meter constant and therefore does not see any value in it retention
	7.	A majority of workshop attendees did not support the inclusion of the aforementioned industry-proposed fields as they would not provide value to the market as a whole. Are any of them worth further consideration? If so, why and what value do they add to the market?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's statement
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	N/A
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	10.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to adding new transformer information fields which includes: CT/VT Accuracy Class, CT/VT Last Test Date?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal
	11.	Do you agree with the validations proposed by AEMO for the transformer information fields? If not, please provide other types of validations that can be applied.	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal
	12.	Do you agree to not to add CT/VT serial number fields, and if you do not agree, can you propose solutions for adding those fields in (i.e. new NMI devices table) and will adding them provide more benefit than costs to your business and customers	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal
Register Level Information	13.	Do you agree with amending the fields Controlled Load and Time of Day to include enumerated list of values? If Yes, what values can be in the enumerated list for the fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Controlled Load</li> <li>- Time of Day</li> </ul>	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controlled Load</li> <li>• Time of Day</li> </ul>
	14.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demand1</li> <li>- Demand2</li> </ul>	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		- Network Additional Information	
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal – This will help clarify what is on site – We would also like to reconsider “Shared Isolation Points Flag” and while this may only be added post a site visit will be help when identify requirements for other site visits
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	Aurora Energy does not believe so
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	Aurora Energy would like to see the number of shared points affected, however understand that this is hard to validate and does not help identify the other sites who share the fuse
	18.	Should “Unknown” be able to be changed into “Yes” / “No”?	Yes
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	20.	Are there any pieces of information that would be useful to explicitly flag for inclusion in the Meter Location field? (these can be included in the definition of the field)	Something like FLS (front left side) FRS (front right side) Free hand text is still useful as AE do use the location in their billing system and is provided by TasNetworks
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal however we are unsure who would provide this data the LNSP or MC?
	22.	If the provision of GPS coordinates for all rural NMIs were made mandatory, does your organisation support the use of "Designated regional area postcodes" to define "rural"? If not, what alternative would your organisation prefer?	Aurora Energy agrees with this approach however, Tasmanian post codes cover vast areas and may not capture all rural areas. This is something we have struggled with when trying to define rural areas using a specific code or reference
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	Yes Aurora Energy would support this
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	Yes Aurora Energy would support this
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	Aurora Energy would like this to also cover any meter exchange

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	As above if not mandatory
	27.	Bearing in mind that GPS coordinates to four decimal places allow identification to the nearest 10 metres, that GPS coordinates to five decimal places allows identification to the nearest metre, and that GPS coordinates to six decimal places allows identification to the nearest 10 centimetres, if the field is added should it be to four, five, or six decimal places?	Aurora Energy would recommend 5 decimal places
Meter Read and Estimation Information	28.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to amend or remove the meter read and estimation information as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposed approach
Meter Communications Information	29.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the meter communications information fields as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposed approach



## 2.2 NMI details

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Address Structure	30.	Do you agree with the proposal to remove unstructured address fields, following a period for data holders to clean their existing data?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposed approach
	31.	Are there any reasons to keep the Unstructured Address fields, given that additional locational information (e.g. "pump by the dam") can be provided in other fields, e.g. Location Descriptor where we have proposed to lengthen the characters available?	As per the pre-consultation session I believe it was agreed that there would be no reason to keep the unstructured address if the other fields were extended
	32.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated by AEMO on the basis of structured address (as is currently done for DPIDs) and thereafter by LNSPs?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposed approach
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Aurora Energy agrees with AEMO's proposed approach
	34.	If AEMO were to add the G-NAF PID field (which would uniquely identify a physical address), do participants believe there is use in keeping the DPID field?	Aurora Energy does not see the need to keep the DPID address as this is used as a postal address identifier and not a location identifier

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Aurora Energy would support this approach
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	Aurora Energy would prefer the G-NAF PID approach
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Aurora Energy has no preference
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Aurora Energy has no preference

### 2.3 NER Schedule 7.1

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
NER Schedule 7.1 Rule Change	39.	Do you see any benefit in Schedule 7.1 remaining as-is? If so, please detail the benefit.	Aurora Energy see no benefit in this remaining
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	Aurora Energy would support this approach

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Fields referenced in the NER that are not implemented in MSATS	41.	Do you see any benefit in adding the aforementioned fields to MSATS? If so, in which table would you propose they be added and how can the quality of data be ensured?	Aurora Energy does not see the benefit from adding these fields

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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
3.2 NMI's Affected	All connection points points where a transmission network connects to another transmission Network – Delete repeated word (points)
4.1. Field definitions - Table 3 CATS_METER_REGISTER - Field definitions	Aurora Energy supports Manufacture and model be made mandatory
4.1. Field definitions - Table 3 CATS_METER_REGISTER - Field definitions	Should Read Type Code not be Mandatory rather than required

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
4.1. Field definitions - Table 3 CATS_METER_REGISTER - Field definitions	NextScheduledReadDate – Should this not include MRAM Type 4a meters as well
9.1. Field definitions Table 18 CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER- Field definitions	<p>RegisterID states For Interval Meters, the RegisterID must match the content of the 'Suffix' within the CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER table. E.g. 'E1', 'B1', 'Q1', 'K1', etc.</p> <p>Suffix states For Interval Meters, the Suffix in the CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER table must match the RegisterID in the CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER table. E.g. 'E1', 'B1'</p> <p>However this is a known issue that these do not match yet they are mandatory and while as mentioned previously, while this needs to be tidied up – this is probably not the best time to carry out this exercise.</p>

#### 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
Life Support Flag	While it was previously discussed and dismissed – Aurora Energy still believes that while this is attached to the Premise and not a person this does not breach any privacy issues and is considered as part of the premise information.
Type 4A reason - Reason for 4a metering. No telecoms or customer refusal.	This does not seemed to have been addressed or considered in this consultation and was going to be added “To be added, pending Legal advice. Would be populated by MC or MPB.”