

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

## CONSULTATION – First Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

*Participant: ERM Power*

*Completion Date: 31/03/2020*

# 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..... 12

## 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?	Yes – but believe it should be the market operators function to update
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Yes – but believe it should be the market operators function to update
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	Yes The field is useful for the retailers to identify meter churn obligations and site impact on transfers under the current procedure. Usefulness decreases under the AEMI's switching rule changes.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	
	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>	No
	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?	No
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	No

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Yes
	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?	Yes
	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.	Yes
	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	
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>	Yes, we do support the field, but we need to understand the proposed enumerated field values. Please provide examples of the values.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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> <li>- Network Additional Information</li> </ul>	Yes
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	Yes
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	No
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	Yes – The value should be Yes or No only, otherwise, it defeats the purpose.
	18.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	Yes – Enforce Yes/No value.
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	

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)	
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	Yes, the field should be required for all new sites where the meter is currently capable of providing the location for all new sites.
	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?	
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	Yes
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	Yes
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	Yes – where the meters are capable of providing the location for all new sites.

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?	Yes - where the meters are capable.
	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?	Five
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?	Yes
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?	

## 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?	No - The address fields should remain unchanged as we will not have the structured address for all sites, especially new connections.  Example, phone towers & pumps that don't always have the mandatory information for a structured address to be created.
	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 above
	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?	Yes – We need to investigate and understand the benefits, especially if we are going ahead with the structured addresses.
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Yes – We need to investigate and understand the benefits, especially if we are going ahead with the structured addresses.
	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?	Yes – We requires the DPID field for address/property creation. We need to

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			understand the G-NAF field and system impact in details.
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	No
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	No
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Yes
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes

### 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.	Yes

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	As previously commented, we see that the AEMC need to be involved in changes made in this space and that moving this information will remove them from these decisions
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?	No

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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

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

Heading	Participant Comments