

MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Powerlink Queensland (PLINKP/PLINKMP)

Completion Date: 10/03/2020

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? | Yes, to the NMI field, not to the meter itself. Exemptions on WIGS NMIs can be for the CTs and or VTs, not the meter itself, so having it on the NMI would cover the whole metering installation. |
| | 2. | Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not? | Yes, to the NMI field, not to the meter itself. Exemptions on WIGS NMIs can be for the CTs and or VTs, not the meter itself, so having it on the NMI would cover the whole metering installation. |
| | 3. | If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field? | No, no applicable for WIGS NMIs |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 4. | If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why? | Failure can take place in any part of the metering installation which includes the meter, CTs, VTs or the wiring. |
| | 5. | What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market? | REVENUE, CHECK are the relevant enumerations for WIGS NMIs that we currently use. |
| | 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, we see no value in retaining these as we currently don't use them. |
| | 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, we don't see any benefit from these proposed fields for WIGS NMIs. |
| | 8. | Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields? | No, no other comments. |

| 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, we agree to the splitting of the transformer information, however keep in mind that we use up to 12 CTs and 12 VTs in a WIGS metering scheme. |
| | 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? | No, we don't agree with the addition of these new fields into the standing data for WIGS NMIs as CT/VT Accuracy Class determined by the rules and MSATS isn't the tool to police compliance. |
| | 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. | Entering and maintain this additional information for WIGS NMIs is time-consuming with little benefit. |
| | 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 | We agree that CT/VT serial number fields shouldn't be added as maintaining this information in MSATS will be time-consuming with little benefit. The rules determine that we have an asset management tool to store this information, on which we are audited on. Having it in MSATS would be redundant. |
| 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: - Controlled Load | We agree to amend these fields to be enumerated. For WIGS NMIs we would use the following enumerations. Controlled Load: NO, CL1, CL2 |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | - Time of Day | Time of Day: INTERVAL |
| | 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>We agree with removal of the Demand1 and Demand2 fields.</p> <p>We currently store information in the Network Additional Information field which identifies the substation and whether it is on the Revenue or Check meter. We agree that this field could also be removed as this information can also be found in the Additional Site information/Meter Location and meter use field of the associated meter.</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? | We don't agree that this field should be included for WIGS NMIs as it will be always the same, thus providing no value. |
| | 16. | Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field? | This information could be very complex. We suggest this is better covered off in the NMI application. |
| Shared Isolation Points Flag Field | 17. | Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated? | No value for TNSPs for WIGS NMIs, this is covered off in the application and drawing updates. |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 18. | Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"? | Yes, but if possible should not be able to change to unknown. |
| Metering Installation Location Information | 19. | Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information? | WE don't support the deletion of the Additional Site Information field. We already have it populated for most of our Meters, however the same information we put in it could be in the meter location field. |
| | 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) | For meters located in a substation the substation name and the asset it's metering. |
| | 21. | Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites? | No, there are potential network security issues around the provision of this critical infrastructure asset data. Also, some sites may need to be surveyed too find the GPS co-ordinates. |
| | 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? | Prefer to exclude WIGS NMIs from needing to have GPS co-ordinates for network security reasons. |
| | 23. | Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter? | We provide no comment as we don't have any MRIMs. |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 24. | Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations? | Prefer to exclude WIGS NMIs from needing to have GPS co-ordinates for network security reasons. |
| | 25. | Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios? | No, not for any scenarios involving WIGS NMIs. |
| | 26. | Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios? | No, not for any scenarios involving WIGS NMIs. |
| | 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? | The more accurate the better for the purposed of identifying a meter's location for a DNSP, as opposed to locating a premises / parcel of land. For a TNSP WIGS NMIs the metering installation could spread over a few 100 square metres so 2 decimal spaces is sufficient. Suggest differentiating between the TNSP vs DNSP or by metering Type. |
| 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? | Agree but not due to the proposal above but because we only have Type 1 to 3 metering on WIGS NMIs which don't make use of these fields. |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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? | We agree to the removal of this field as we don't use these fields for WIGS NMIs. |

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? | We agree with the removal of unstructured address fields, however some of our connections still do not have structured addresses. |
| | 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? | "Pump by the dam" is no use to a TNSP, building name has been used to identify the substation. |
| | 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? | We agree with the addition of this field if it is to be populated by AEMO. |

| Information Category | Question No. | Question | Participant Comments |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 33. | Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs? | We don't agree with the proposal to add this field if it's to be populated by the LNSP as we currently don't store this information and a requirement on us to manage this information would be time-consuming for little value on WIGS NMIs |
| | 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? | No, the additional of the G-NAF PID field would make the DPID redundant. |
| | 35. | Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added? | No, these fields provide no value for WIGS NMIs. |
| | 36. | Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added? | No, these fields provide no value for WIGS NMIs. |
| Feeder Class | 37. | Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland? | We agree for non-WIGS NMIs |
| Transmission Node Identifier2 | 38. | Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2? | We agree to the introduction of a TNI2 field provided it is populated by AEMO as this field provides no value for us. |

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. | No, it's currently too prescriptive and some fields listed haven't been implemented in MSATS. |
| | 40. | Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why. | Yes, we support the proposal. We see this as a more efficient way for AEMO and participants to manage the rules requirement around what standing data should be required. |
| 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, we see no benefit in adding any of these fields for WIGS NMIs. |

3. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

| Section No/Field Name | Participant Comments |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Wholesale Standing Data | The minimum required meter standing data for TNSP wholesale connection points (WIGS) is very different to that required for DNSPs or Local Retailer connection point metering. (eg TNSPs only have Type 1 to 3 metering). If possible TNSP's should be excluded from needing to maintain |

| Section No/Field Name | Participant Comments |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>fields that have no relevance to wholesale NMIs. Due to these differences it is suggested that TNSP's have different mandatory field requirements.</p> <p>The feedback provided by PQ has highlighted these specific fields where different validation requirement is preferred.</p> |
| | |
| | |
| | |

4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

| Heading | Participant Comments |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NMI Aggregate Field | For the NMI Aggregate Field should there be a 3 rd option for when it's both, e.g. a battery or load and gen behind the meter. I know it won't be part of this consultation, but there might be value in exploring this at a later date. |
| | |
| | |