MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: Tasmanian Networks Pty. Ltd.*

***Completion Date**: 31/03/2020*

Table of Contents

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
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Yes
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	TasNetworks believes there is more value with populating the exemption number and expiry date.
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	N/A

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?	TasNetworks does not believe that any further additions are required.
	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. - 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?	TasNetworks believe that consideration should be given to transitioning the fields to optional, to reduce the impact on participants when making system changes.
	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?	TasNetworks believe that the meter Manufacturer/Model fields should be required instead of mandatory. Test Result Accuracy – combining a date and extra character is not an efficient database practice. But further to this is there any value in

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			this field? If the test is failed, then the meter should be replaced.
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	TasNetworks don't believe this information would be widely used by participants outside of MPB/MC and therefore don't see any value in populating this information in MSATS. More value if this is kept externally to MSATS. TasNetworks believes the existing Multiplier field along with the CT and VT ratios are the only transformer information of value.
	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?	TasNetworks don't believe this information would be widely used by participants outside of MPB/MC and therefore don't see any value in populating this information in MSATS. More value if this is kept externally to MSATS.
	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.	TasNetworks don't believe this information would be widely used by participants outside of MPB/MC and therefore don't see any value in populating this information in MSATS. More value if this is kept externally to MSATS.
	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	TasNetworks don't believe this information would be widely used by participants outside of MPB/MC and therefore don't see any value in

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		provide more benefit than costs to your business and customers	populating this information in MSATS. More value if this is kept externally to MSATS.
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 - Time of Day	TasNetworks strong preference would be for both of these fields to remain unchanged.
	14.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields? - Demand1 - Demand2 - Network Additional Information	Partly, Network Additional Information is used by TasNetworks is used to populate basic meter register circuit information and the meter tariff code. There is no other field suitable to provide this information. TasNetworks agree to removing the demand 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?	No. TasNetworks don't believe there is sufficient value in this information being populated in MSATS.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	As above.
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	TasNetworks believe this fields should be included in the CATS NMI DATA table instead of CATS METER REGISTER. The suggested values may be sufficient, but this issue will require further consultation with the industry to understand the business processes surrounding it.
	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?	TasNetworks preferred solution would be for this field to remain, however this change could be accommodated.
	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.
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	TasNetworks would need to consider the organisational impact of recording and storing this information. We are cautious about making it mandatory given the potential system (market

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			& field) and business process changes required.
	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?	If mandatory, this would be an acceptable definition of rural to TasNetworks.
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	N/A for TasNetworks, no MRIM meters in the Tasmanian jurisdiction.
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	TasNetworks would need to consider the organisational impact of recording and storing this information. We are cautious about making it mandatory given the potential system (market & field) and business process changes required.
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	No.
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	Yes, TasNetworks believes that GPS coordinates should only be required fields.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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?	TasNetworks believes that 5 decimal places would be adequate. In some case 4 decimal places may be all that can be captured due to site restrictions.
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?	Yes

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
	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?	No
	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?	TasNetworks agree that AEMO could populate the field based on addresses, however we would need to evaluate the viability of populating them going forward. We don’t see any benefit from a DNSP point of view to populate this field. Could AEMO consider populating the G-NAF via regular updates?
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	No
	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. TasNetworks do not use the DPID.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Section and DP numbers N/A for TasNetworks.
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	Section and DP numbers N/A for TasNetworks.
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	N/A for TasNetworks
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes, but this is not relevant for TasNetworks.

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
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	Yes

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
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
Removed Fields	TasNetworks believe it would be prudent to change fields to Optional rather than removing them altogether. This would reduce the impact on participants making system changes.
New Mandatory Fields	In the same vein as above, it may be a good idea to introduce a transitional approach to making these new fields Required for a period of time to allow participants extra time for development of systems. Participants may be forced to populate fields with information which may not be known or 100% accurate. Example of this is Shared Fuse which would need to be populated to NO before the information is known this may be in contradiction to the rule change that is still under consultation, given that is intended only to be provided if known.