

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

## CONSULTATION – First Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

*Participant: Red Energy and Lumo Energy*

*Completion Date: 31 March 2020*

# Table of Contents

Context	<b>3</b>
<b>Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Issues Paper</b>	<b>3</b>
Metering Installation Information	3
NMI details	10
NER Schedule 7.1	11
Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline	<b>12</b>
Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter	<b>13</b>

## 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	Qn 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?	Red Energy and Lumo Energy (Red and Lumo) do not object to the addition of this field to MSATS.
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Red and Lumo do not object to the addition of this field to MSATS.
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	Red and Lumo support the addition of this field, as this would assist with fault finding and metering prioritisation, as well as reduce transfer restrictions.
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	No comment at this time

	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	No comment at this time
	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>	<p>Red and Lumo see value in the following fields:</p> <p><b>Meter Route:</b> At the point in which there are no requirements to physically read meters, Red and Lumo only support this field being deleted. While non-smart meters continue to exist, this field must continue to be populated by the MC (DNSP).</p> <p><b>Meter Test Results Notes:</b> Whilst this may be difficult to make structured, it could be one of the exception cases whereby free text is allowed. We do see value in having this field populated, if meter test reports are not.</p> <p><b>Next Test Date:</b> Useful in determining booking metering test requirements in advance or not, as well as informing customers of potential upcoming meter tests.</p>
	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?	<p>Red and Lumo see value in the following fields:</p> <p><b>Meter Family Failure:</b> This would assist with fault finding and metering prioritisation, reduce transfer restrictions.</p> <p><b>Meter Commission Date:</b> This field would provide the retailer with information relevant to</p>

			<p>the metering installation, such as age. It is relevant for network and metering settlements.</p> <p><b>Disconnection Method:</b> It will provide the incoming retailer the same visibility of the current retailer who receives the information in a service order response. This field is useful in order to ensure accurate information can be provided to customers. It can also assist in the appropriate actions to be taken, and avoid any potential delays to reconnect. We question whether AEMO can collate this information given it is a B2B Procedural matter.</p> <p><b>Meter Locks:</b> We strongly support this field as it will assist in determining potential access issues. Recommend this field is enumerated. Some customers, especially new (move-in) customers, will not be aware of any locks or access issues to their meters. Being able to proactively advise them of this can save time and effort, and provide a better customer experience.</p> <p><b>Meter Test Report:</b> This field should be made mandatory and backdated to ensure quality. Our only other idea is that a B2B process is created and a standardised format used (based on NMI M 6 - 2) so that the reports are easier to read and can be extracted by an automated system more easily. Can be useful for</p>
--	--	--	---

			customers to be advised of test results, and provide them with more detail (and levels of standard).
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	For the <b>Meter Read Type Code</b> field, Red and Lumo suggest that rather than combining four pieces of information in a single field, each could be separated into its own relevant enumerated field - allowing for easier future changes if required. Also, rather than A = 5, B = 15 etc, it would be better to have an 'interval_length' field with values 5, 10, 15, 30 etc. (Noting that NEM12 allows 10-minute interval length, which is not provided for in this proposal).
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Red and Lumo support this proposal.
	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?	Red and Lumo support this 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.	No comment at this time

	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 comment at this time
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>	Red and Lumo support amending the fields and including enumerated lists.
	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>	Red and Lumo do not support the removal of <b>Network Additional Information</b> . Removal of this will increase costs in the long run as any additional matters can be added here instead of requiring a schema change.
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	Red and Lumo agree that this information is beneficial. However, it is more valuable with each component to have its own separate field to make the processing and querying of this information simpler and more accurate. For example, where there are only two options (shared fuse), it could be fulfilled with a Y/N flag. Again, this field should be populated upon creation by the DNSPs. Optionality for this field will render it useless.
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	No comment at this time

Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	No comment at this time
	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?	Red and Lumo value the information provided in this field. However, Red and Lumo would support having the various pieces of information stored in their own structured fields.
	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)	No comment at this time
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	Red and Lumo believe this could be useful for contestable metering providers needing to exchange non-contestable meters for contestable meters.
	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?	No comment at this time
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	No comment at this time

	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	No comment at this time
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	No comment at this time
		Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	No comment at this time
	26.	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?	Ideally 5 decimal places.
Meter Read and Estimation Information	27.	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?	Red and Lumo believe that if the Measurement Type field was populated and held to a standard, it could be useful in determining if the MC/LNSP is providing all metering data from a meter. This is particularly useful in disputes where sites have been configured for solar before approval. It should be made mandatory.
Meter Communications Information	28.	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?	No comment at this time

## 2.2 NMI details

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Address Structure	29.	Do you agree with the proposal to remove unstructured address fields, following a period for data holders to clean their existing data?	Yes, Red and Lumo support the removal of the unstructured address post the thorough clean-up of the structured address, and the addition of newly proposed fields (ie: G-NAF).
	30.	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?	In the long run, Red and Lumo do not see any reason the Unstructured Address fields should be kept so long as all currently available additional information is re-populated elsewhere.
	31.	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?	Red and Lumo strongly recommend that G-NAF ID should be added in, and that in the first instance this field should be populated by AEMO for consistency and to ensure accuracy. Thereafter it can be managed by the LNSPs.
	32.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Red and Lumo would support the LNSPs being entirely responsible for the population.
	33.	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 - Red and Lumo believe that at the very least for a transition period the DPID field should be kept as participants get used to utilising G-NAF ID. DPID should then be reviewed later on for removal.

	34.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Red and Lumo have no specific stand on having the section number and DP number added in, if G-NAF was added.
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	Red and Lumo strongly recommend that G-NAF ID be added, not only as it mitigates the need for more additional fields (DP number, Section, DPID), but it is an ID which remains consistent with that property - and still remains linked if that property becomes subdivided. However, if it was not added, we have no specific position on having Section Number or DP Number.
Feeder Class	36.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	No comment at this time
Transmission Node Identifier2	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes, Red and Lumo agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2 as it will enable the successful introduction of global settlements processing.

### 2.3 NER Schedule 7.1

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
NER Schedule 7.1 Rule Change	38.	Do you see any benefit in Schedule 7.1 remaining as-is? If so, please detail the benefit.	There are some fields (e.g. Write Passwords) that do not belong in MSATS, but are required for the market. We will reassess our position at the completion of this project, but at this stage

			there is no harm in MSATS containing some of the schedule, but removal of the schedule is not required. This change has not been justified that it will meet the NEO in order for us to support it being removed.
	39.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	
Fields referenced in the NER that are not implemented in MSATS	40.	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 comment at this time

### 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