

MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Origin Energy

Completion Date: 31/03/20

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..... 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?	<p>Origin supports the addition of this field in MSATS as it would assist MPB's with identifying which sites have exemptions. In addition, there is currently an obligation on MC's to notify participants of exemptions being in place on sites. This field along with the expiry date of the ERF will act as the notification to all participants for each site.</p> <p>The responsibility of updating this field should be on AEMO to add/remove the reference on approval/closure of the exemption.</p>
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	<p>Origin supports the addition of this field in MSATS; however, seeks clarification from AEMO that when the exemption expires, will the information be removed?</p> <p>As mentioned in Question 1, the expectation is AEMO would update this information.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	Origin supports the addition of the Meter Family Failure field as it would assist an MPB in identifying difficult to access sites and will also provide vital information during a meter malfunction.
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	While Origin supports the proposed amendments, there is concern that these fields could risk bad behaviour in the market and negatively impact customers as participants may actively avoid sites where there is a family failure flag.
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	Origin's view is that identifying sites that are not simple 'revenue' sites such as Logical meters would be beneficial for the market.
	6.	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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? 	No comment
	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 comment

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	No comment
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Yes, Origin agrees with splitting transformer information into CT and VT types.
	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, Origin agrees with AEMO's proposal with regards to adding new transformer information fields. As meters are tested separately to the CT/VT, the retailer is able to determine and provide information to the customer if required as well as ensuring that external MC/MP's are complying with their obligations.
	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, Origin agrees with the validations proposed by AEMO for the transformer information fields.
	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	No, Origin does not agree to add CT/VT serial number fields as this would be costly to undertake. Currently this information is verified directly with the MP's and works effectively.
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:	Yes, Origin agrees with amending the fields, Controlled Load and Time of Day, to include enumerated list of values.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Controlled Load - Time of Day 	The values should identify/differentiate between Ripple, Time of Day, Internal and External.
	14.	<p>Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand1 - Demand2 - Network Additional Information 	<p>These fields would have added value but would need to be extended to cope with rolling 12 month demand. If not, then they can be removed.</p> <p>Origin seeks clarification if these fields will this information be stored in any other fields moving forward?</p>
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	<p>Yes, Origin agrees with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as it will allow retailers to appropriately take action when churning meters as well as reduce wasted visits in the field.</p> <p>Origin also seeks confirmation if information regarding whether a site has solar or a battery will be included?</p>
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	No comment
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	<p>The values should be Y/N or Blank for Unknown.</p> <p>AEMO should consider a method for linking all shared supply points together (such as a code that applies to all the NMI's on the same shared supply) to reduce overall industry cost in needing to maintain this data. There also needs to be a clear</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			understanding on who will update/maintain this information i.e. DNSP or MP.
	18.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	Yes, as per response for question 17, on site visit or becoming aware of the shared fuse it should be updated to yes or no (required).
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	Origin does not support the deletion of Additional Site Information. Whilst GPS coordinates is good for location, DNSP's may have additional information in their own internal systems which assists them with locating a site. Having this information available will assist in reducing wasted visits. There is also value in adding this field in the MP C7 report.
	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)	This would be useful with GPS coordinates to give an indication of how to locate the meter.
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	Yes, Origin supports the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural 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?	Yes, Origin supports the use of "Designated regional area postcodes" to define "rural".

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	Yes, Origin supports the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter.
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	Yes, Origin supports the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations.
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	<p>Yes, Origin believes that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for existing meters in case of meter fault issues or for any other emergency.</p> <p>There is an opportunity for DNSP's as part of their meter reading schedule to capture the GPS coordinates for every site. This way within 90 days of a meter read cycle all GPS coordinates would be available.</p>
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	Yes, Origin believes that the provision of this information should be made required for whenever any party attends the a site.
	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?	Origin suggests six decimal places as it gives the nearest point of identification and ensures the coordinates are provided to the closest point possible.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
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?	Origin supports AEMO's proposal to amend or remove the meter read and estimation information.
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?	Origin supports AEMO's proposal to remove the meter communications information fields.

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?	Yes, Origin agrees with the proposal to remove unstructured address field as it will allow for clear identification of sites and remove ambiguity from unstructured address details. In addition, Origin seek clarification on how long will the period be for data holders to clean the data?
	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	Origin's position is that there is no reason to keep the unstructured address.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		Descriptor where we have proposed to lengthen the characters available?	In addition, all address information needs to be discoverable in the C7 reports to enable the Meter Providers to have the full information.
	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, Origin agrees 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 as it will assist with validating addresses.
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Yes, Origin agrees with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs.
	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?	Origin supports keeping the DPID field.
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	No comment
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	No comment
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Yes, Origin agrees with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes, Origin agrees with the proposal to introduce TNI2.

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.	Origin's position is that there needs to be an NER Clause which makes it clear that fields are to be maintained by the relevant participant – not simply a procedure but also an obligation.
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	As per question 39, this should go hand in hand with the standing data review feedback and NER will need to align to reflect those mandatory fields once the standing data fields are confirmed.
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?	Origin's position is to not include obsolete or irrelevant fields into MSATS.

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