MSATS Standing Data Review
- ## MSDR Issues Paper
- ## Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: *Vector Metering*

Completion Date: *31 March 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, furthermore we support AEMO updating this field when they issue the Exemption to the MC. This is the most efficient way to 1) manage exemptions and 2) notify impacted participants of the existence of the malfunction and the exemption;
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Yes, as above, Providing the date of expiry will provide all impacted participants a latest date for when the malfunction will be resolved by. MSATS should also be able to provide a history of the exemption extensions to give a complete picture of the duration taken to resolve. It should also be related to the individual meter so that when the meter is replaced the exemption is automatically closed.

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?	We support the above fields but if these do not progress then we believe a malfunction flag with appropriate code is more useful than just a Family failure flag. This malfunction flag should have at least the following values; e.g. Adhoc malfunction, Family failure. This would allow the monitoring of performance of resolving each class of malfunction.
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	We do not support the addition of a *Meter Test Result Accuracy* field, because any meter that fails accuracy will be replaced at the time of the test or shortly after because it is non-compliant. By definition if the Meter is still in MSATS then it has passed the test;
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	Vector only deals with physical metering so 'Revenue' is about the only use we could assign. Given that smart meters now have many capabilities and can provide data for many purposes e.g. customer billing, network management etc, is trying to allocate a single use prudent?

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			We accept that physical metering may need to be separate to logical metering but suggest that this be better done via a separate meter type.
	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?	We do not support the removal of *Last test date*. We do not support the inclusion of *Meter Test Result Accuracy (see above)*. We support the removal of Meter Point. This field is used by the MDP to order the sequence that a meter at an NMI appears in the field reading device and therefore has no relevance to anyone other than the manual meter reader. Meter Point doesn't have any relationship to suffix. Meter Constant was used to count the number of revolutions of a BASIC meter disk per Wh; This is not relevant for Electronic meters; Recommend its removal.
	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?	See below for comments on proposed fields Disconnection Method – Not required because the Meter Status/NMI status will provide this information. i.e. disconnected physically by the

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			DNSP or via lifting the contactor in the meter by the MP.
			• Meter Commission Date – Unclear how this is useful. Retailers can see the latest meter details records via NMI discovery or MSATS metering reports which contain Start Dates. If meter has been in place for 5 years it is unclear how this is useful to anyone who is not the MP, who already know this information;
			• Meter Locks – Knowing if a key was required would be useful to avoid wasted truck visits when trying to replace a Malfunctioning/Family Failure meter; This would allow the MP to contact the customer to gain access before attending. Currently access issues related to locks impact up to 15% of malfunctions and family failure work;
			• Minimum interval length – No value - remove; All smart meters can be configured for almost any interval;
			• Meter Family Failure – There should be a Malfunction indicator – See comments 1-3 above;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			• Meter Test Report – No Value; MP can provide if necessary and has an obligation to do so. • Plug-in Meter Flag – This would give some indication of the complexities in exchanging the meter. There are estimated to be 100k-150k plug in meters across the NEM. MC's need to ensure specialised metering equipment (plug-in adapter bases) are available. These are not a standard item that all techs carry. Knowing this before attending site would reduce wasted truck visits.
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	Vector believes MSATS needs to transition to near real-time updates for the NMI Status and Meter Status. This is required so that all parties can be aware of the accurate energisation status of a site as soon as possible. This will help with a better customer experience when they are moving into a premise and avoid customer left off supply; AEMO could use this as a prototype for moving all MSATS data to real time…
Metering Installation	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Yes

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Transformer Information			
	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
	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;
	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, we believe CT/VT serial numbers should be maintained where possible; Should good data modelling practise dictate that these should be in a separate CATS table then we support this as well;
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	yes, however it would need to reflect all published DNSP CL schemes, not just CL1 and CL2- Note: Current NTC do not necessarily reflect the time settings programmed at the site. DB's have confirmed that in some instances you have no way of knowing the legacy switching arrangements until you visit site and look at the time switch settings; Customers are entitled to keep these switching times under the

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			DNSP's connection arrangements even where the meter has been replaced. Lack of clarity on the switching times can lead to customers having periods with no hot water or dedicate circuits being energised outside published switching times resulting in higher bills for customers as their devices consume energy outside the tariffs designated times.
			Placing these values into an enumerated value needs to be carefully considered because could create a barrier to accurately represent any new switching products. If a party introduces a new scheme/program, then there would need to be an update to the enumerated list – this could create an environment where the data becomes inaccurate as business avoid having to go through this process.
			Time of Day should be removed for Interval meters. It is concept that is not relevant to an interval Data Stream;
	14.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields? - Demand1 - Demand2	Agreed to remove Demand and Network Additional Information Fields;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		- Network Additional Information	
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	*Phase in Use* seems to be describing characteristics of the supply to the premise. The Meter Register table contains information about the meter, not the Supply. There can be numerous meters at a connection – mixture of 3 phase and single phase; Use of a combined field to represent the configuration has no benefit over individual fields; We support the use of individual fields; The below fields are recommended and reflect the key configuration at a site for the *Meter.* • Meter Connection type should be "*Whole Current connected*" or "*Transformer connected*"; • Meter Type should indicate "*Single Phase*" or "*3 Phase*"; • Transformer type should indicate *Low Voltage (CT)* or *High Voltage (VT)*;
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	See 15.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	Shared Fuse should reflect whether this Connection Point (NMI) can be independently isolated without impacting any other NMI. The only values required would be yes or no; Obviously all new meter installations will be able to be independently isolated so these will have a value of 'Yes' . The issue will be legacy metering. MP's should be obligated to determine a sites status. If this does occur then this flag will be of little value; By calling this field 'Shared Fuse' it is not immediately obvious what this represents. Suggest calling the field 'Can be independently isolated' flag or the *CBII flag*. This field should not be on the CATS_METER_REGISTER entity but should be on the CATS_NMI_DATA as it represents the status of the connection point or NMI and not an individual meter;
	18.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	MP's responsible for legacy metering should be required to reflect the status on all meters; Given that these meters are visited every 3 months for reading MDP can advise the MP of the status and MSATS can be updated to accurately reflect the NMI status;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	Yes
	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?	Yes;
	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;
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	Yes;
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	Yes;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	If you do not make the fields mandatory and population becomes 'optional' then businesses will choose not to collect and not to populate. This will dilute the benefits of collecting the information. Locating meters especially in rural locations is a material issue; All meters regardless of type should have location details made available in MSATS;
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	If you do not make the fields mandatory and population becomes 'optional' then businesses will choose not to collect and not to populate. This will dilute the benefits of collecting the information. Locating meters especially in rural locations is a material issue; All meters regardless of type should have location details made available in MSATS;
	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?	Four; 10 meters is close enough.

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?	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; There is no need for a grace period as businesses should start cleaning data immediately so unstructured address can be removed as soon as procedures become effective;
	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;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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?	Maybe; The biggest issue on addresses relates to new suburbs and new connections; This is because Streets have not been named or sign posted, or change their name so it can be difficult to accurately know you are in the correct location; G-NAF data states it takes between 2 and 6 months to get updated and made available. Presumably it will be like other sources e.g. Lands and Survey data, and will most likely be well after when a retailer needs to install a meter. Once a meter is in place and its GPS location is in MSATS there is no need for the G-NAF Data;
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	See 32; Will accurate G-NAF Data be available at NMI Allocation? Presumably the retailer will need to provide this to the DB, much like the address today…Who provides this to the Retailer?
	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?	DPID is a postal address, G-NAF is a physical location; Presumably these are used for different purposes; We don't use DPID …
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Depends on timing availability of G-NAF..See 32 and 33.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	yes
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Yes. Doesn't impact MP's;
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Yes. Doesn't impact MP's;

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, remove the required MSATS content from Rules and place it in the procedures;
Fields referenced in the NER that are not	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;

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
implemented in 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
Life support	Vector believes there are a growing list of compelling reasons for having a life support flag against a NMI; Not least is the situation where the FRMP who is unaware that a new customer at a site who has indicated life support status to a new retailer who have not yet become the FRMP (transfer is in flight), can remote Deen a site without knowing that the customer is life support; Life support status should be reflected in MSATS so that all parties who are responsible for the site can ensure that protections are provided to the customer.