

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

## CONSULTATION – First Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

*Participant: SA Power Networks*

*Completion Date: 23 March 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 ..... 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?	SA Power Networks have a neutral position on this item.
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	SA Power Networks have a neutral position on this item.
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	

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?	
	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>	SA Power Networks support the removal of fields.
	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?	
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	SA Power Networks do not see value in the Meter Read Type Code being used for Type 5, 6, 7 or Non-Contestable UMS meters. The major value of this field and reason behind the proposed change was to enable identification of the associated metering data interval length. There is only a single interval length possible for these metering types and this is well known

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			by industry. SA Power Networks therefore request that any changes make it clear that this field is not required to be provided for these meter types.
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	SA Power Networks have a neutral position on this item.
	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?	SA Power Networks do not support the inclusion of these fields for Type 5 & 6 NMI's where we are providing the MPB function.
	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.	SA Power Networks have a neutral position on this item.
	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	SA Power Networks agree that these field should not be added.
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:	SA Power Networks support these proposed changes.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Controlled Load</li> <li>- Time of Day</li> </ul>	
	14.	<p>Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demand1</li> <li>- Demand2</li> <li>- Network Additional Information</li> </ul>	SA Power Networks support the removal of fields.
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	SA Power Networks had not Identified any additions.
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	If this change is imposed on the industry by the AEMC, then the current values are sufficient. These changes should not proceed unless mandated via the AEMC final determination linked to the MC Planned Interruption consultation.
	18.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	SA Power Networks be that "Unknown" should be kept and used for day 1.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	SA Power Networks support the removal of 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)	-
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	SA Power Networks support this approach however, allowances should be provided where the LNSP is acting as the MP as we may not have capture information for 100% of the required sites and this will be a costly activity to collect and populate – flexible timeframes should be provided to enable an efficient process to be used.
	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?	SA Power Networks support this concept, however, allowances will need to be made that enable for the exclusion of major regional centres/townships that would fall within the post code areas.
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	SA Power Networks believe that GPS coordinates should only be mandatory in rural locations – subject to exclusion provided in response to Q21.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	SA Power Networks think that there may be some merit in considering the inclusion of all business/commercial type sites excluding the CBD. (The CBD will present issues as GPS coordinates will not provide full value due to close proximity of different sites).
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.
	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?	SA Power Networks would suggest that the systems field design should be future proofed and therefore provide for six decimal places but the procedures provide flexibility in the length that can be provided.
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?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.



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?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.

## 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?	<p>SA Power Networks have invested a significant amount and time and resources to improve the quality of site addressing information held within our systems, however, this work is ongoing any solutions should continue to provide and maintain the current data held within unstructured fields where no current structured address is provided.</p> <p>SA Power Networks would support the provision of any newly created NMI's with only a structured format.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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?	See response to Q30
	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?	<p>SA Power Networks do not hold this information within our systems as we use other reference data to establish and maintain an accurate site address information and we would not want to be responsible for the provision of this information.</p> <p>If AEMO proceed with being the owner and therefore responsible for the provision and maintenance of this data, then AEMO will need to ensure they have in place a process that would quickly maintain this information in line with any ongoing changes that the LNSP makes to other site address fields.</p>
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	SA Power Networks does not support the provision of this information – we believe that structured and accurate site address information is a better solution rather than creating another reference point that may be incorrect and misleading.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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?	SA Power Networks did not support the inclusion of the DPID field when previously included in MSATS by AEMO.
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	SA Power Networks would be supportive of the inclusion of Section Number and DP Number only.
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	SA Power Networks would be supportive of the inclusion of Section Number and DP Number only.
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.

### 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.	
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	SA Power Networks support this proposed change.
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?	

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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

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

Heading	Participant Comments

Heading	Participant Comments