

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Second Draft Determination and Report
- MSATS Procedures – WIGS
- MSATS Procedures – CATS
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline
- Retail Electricity Market Procedures Glossary & Framework
- Exemption Procedure Meter Installation Malfunctions
- Metrology Procedure Part A

## CONSULTATION – Second Draft Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant: Intellihub***

***Completion Date: 24.07.2020***

# Table of Contents

- 1. Context ..... 3
- 2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Second Draft Report ..... 3
- 3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures – CATS..... 7
- 4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS..... 11
- 5. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline ..... 12
- 6. Proposed Changes in Metrology Procedure Part A..... 14
- 7. Proposed Changes in Exemption Procedure Meter Installation Malfunctions ..... 15
- 8. Proposed Changes in Retail Electricity Market Procedures - Glossary and Framework ..... 16
- 9. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 16

## 1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback to the questions raised in the Second Draft Report about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data, and to the second draft changes highlighted in **YELLOW** in the change marked versions of the different procedures and guidelines released in the second draft stage of consultation.

## 2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Second Draft Report

### 2.1 Material Issues

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments																																												
Metering Installation Transformer Information	1.	The proposed CT/VT fields values and validations, as listed above, are provided as examples to stimulate feedback from participants. AEMO notes some feedback that options are missing for CT Types, to allow for HV CTs and LV Special CTs. What is the list of values and validations that you need or want for the enumerated list for the various CT/VT fields? (In the absence of any such feedback, the list proposed by AEMO would provide the initial values for the CT/VT fields)?	<p><a href="#">The following tables provide the various CT/VT information we have found to date, suggest adding these to the AEMO validation list.</a></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CT Type</th> <th>CT Ratio</th> <th>CT/VT Class</th> <th>VT Ratio</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td><a href="#">150/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.05PX</a></td> <td><a href="#">11000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">300/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.2</a></td> <td><a href="#">22000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">600/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.2M</a></td> <td><a href="#">33000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td><a href="#">1200/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.2ME1.5</a></td> <td><a href="#">6600/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">400/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.2ME2.5</a></td> <td><a href="#">66000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">800/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.2S</a></td> <td><a href="#">132000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td><a href="#">1000/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.5</a></td> <td><a href="#">220000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">2000/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.5M</a></td> <td><a href="#">275000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><a href="#">3000/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.5ME1.25</a></td> <td><a href="#">330000/110</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td>S</td> <td><a href="#">200/5</a></td> <td><a href="#">0.5ME1.5</a></td> <td><a href="#">500000/110</a></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CT Type	CT Ratio	CT/VT Class	VT Ratio	A	<a href="#">150/5</a>	<a href="#">0.05PX</a>	<a href="#">11000/110</a>		<a href="#">300/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2</a>	<a href="#">22000/110</a>		<a href="#">600/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2M</a>	<a href="#">33000/110</a>	B	<a href="#">1200/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2ME1.5</a>	<a href="#">6600/110</a>		<a href="#">400/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2ME2.5</a>	<a href="#">66000/110</a>		<a href="#">800/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2S</a>	<a href="#">132000/110</a>	C	<a href="#">1000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5</a>	<a href="#">220000/110</a>		<a href="#">2000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5M</a>	<a href="#">275000/110</a>		<a href="#">3000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5ME1.25</a>	<a href="#">330000/110</a>	S	<a href="#">200/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5ME1.5</a>	<a href="#">500000/110</a>
CT Type	CT Ratio	CT/VT Class	VT Ratio																																												
A	<a href="#">150/5</a>	<a href="#">0.05PX</a>	<a href="#">11000/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">300/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2</a>	<a href="#">22000/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">600/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2M</a>	<a href="#">33000/110</a>																																												
B	<a href="#">1200/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2ME1.5</a>	<a href="#">6600/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">400/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2ME2.5</a>	<a href="#">66000/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">800/5</a>	<a href="#">0.2S</a>	<a href="#">132000/110</a>																																												
C	<a href="#">1000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5</a>	<a href="#">220000/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">2000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5M</a>	<a href="#">275000/110</a>																																												
	<a href="#">3000/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5ME1.25</a>	<a href="#">330000/110</a>																																												
S	<a href="#">200/5</a>	<a href="#">0.5ME1.5</a>	<a href="#">500000/110</a>																																												

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments			
			<a href="#">U</a>	<a href="#">2000/5</a>		<a href="#">0.5ME2</a>
			<a href="#">W</a>	<a href="#">1500/5</a>		<a href="#">0.5ME2.5</a>
			<a href="#">SPECIAL</a>	<a href="#">100/5</a>		<a href="#">0.5S</a>
				<a href="#">1000/5</a>		<a href="#">0.5S EXT 200%</a>
				<a href="#">1200/5</a>		<a href="#">1</a>
				<a href="#">150/5</a>		<a href="#">A</a>
				<a href="#">1500/5</a>		<a href="#">AM</a>
				<a href="#">1600/5</a>		<a href="#">BM</a>
				<a href="#">200/5</a>		<a href="#">UNKNOWN</a>
				<a href="#">2000/5</a>		
				<a href="#">250/5</a>		
				<a href="#">300/5</a>		
				<a href="#">3000/5</a>		
				<a href="#">400/5</a>		
				<a href="#">500/5</a>		
				<a href="#">600/5</a>		
				<a href="#">800/5</a>		
				<a href="#">800/5</a>		
			<a href="#">HV - 1Amp</a>	<a href="#">100/1</a>		
				<a href="#">1000/1</a>		
				<a href="#">120/1</a>		
				<a href="#">150/1</a>		
				<a href="#">200/1</a>		
				<a href="#">25/1</a>		

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments	
				<a href="#">250/1</a>
				<a href="#">30/1</a>
				<a href="#">300/1</a>
				<a href="#">400/1</a>
				<a href="#">50/1</a>
				<a href="#">500/1</a>
				<a href="#">600/1</a>
				<a href="#">75/1</a>
				<a href="#">800/1</a>
			<a href="#">HV - 5Amp</a>	<a href="#">100/5</a>
				<a href="#">1000/5</a>
				<a href="#">1200/5</a>
				<a href="#">150/5</a>
				<a href="#">1500/5</a>
				<a href="#">200/5</a>
				<a href="#">2000/5</a>
				<a href="#">25/5</a>
				<a href="#">30/5</a>
				<a href="#">300/5</a>
				<a href="#">3000/5</a>
				<a href="#">400/5</a>
				<a href="#">50/5</a>
				<a href="#">500/5</a>
				<a href="#">600/5</a>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments	
				<a href="#">75/5</a>
				<a href="#">800/5</a>

### 3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures – CATS

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in **yellow** in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
2.2 (r)	<p>Assuming that the Shared Isolation Point Flag is the intended mechanism for advising participants of the existence of a Shared Fuse arrangement, the mechanism for the FRMP to advise the LNSP of the Shared Fuse arrangement doesn't seem to exist within the defined CATS processes.</p> <p>CATS transactions exist for the LNSP and ENM to advise others of the value to this flag (based on CATS requests for the creation or changing of NMIs), however there are none of these defined for the FRMP, providing them no mechanism to do so. Hence the requirement that they advise the LNSP within 2 days should not be included until such a mechanism exists.</p> <p>If the Shared Isolation Point Flag is not the only mechanism for advising participants of Shared Fuse arrangements, then this mechanism should be well defined before implementing the requirement. Certainly there appears to be no defined mechanism for FRMPs to meet this obligation.</p>
2.2(s)	See 2.2 (r) above
2.3(r)	<p>Noted</p> <p>Although see comments for 2.2 (r) and 2.6 (k)</p> <p>Until the mechanism for advising of Shared Fuse Arrangements is fully defined for each responsible participant, this obligation should not be added to any of them.</p>

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
2.3(s)	See comment for 2.3 (r)
2.3(t)	See comment for 2.3 (r)
2.6(k)	<p>We believe that the responsibility for advising participants of Shared Fuse Arrangements should sit with the Metering Provider rather than the MC, since it is the MP who is the participant most likely to be at site, and therefore most aware of the details of the Fuse and wiring situation at the NMI.</p> <p>While the MC is responsible for co-ordinating the MP work, it is the MP which has first hand knowledge of the shared fuse arrangements at site.</p> <p>Also see comments for 2.2 (r)</p> <p>The currently defined CATS transaction have no mechanism for either the MC or MPB to advise other participants of the existence of the Shared Fuse Arrangement, as none of their CATS transaction currently cater for including the Shared Isolation Point Flag.</p>
2.6(l)	<p>See comments for 2.6(k) above.</p> <p>Please note that the label for 2.6(l) doesn't exist in the document, but is assumed to be the label after 2.6(k).</p>
2.9(k)	Agreed
9.3.4(c)	Agreed
9.3.4(e)	Agreed



Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
9.4.4(c)	Agreed
9.4.4(d)	Agreed
10.1.4(c)	Agreed
10.1.4(e)	Agreed
10.2.4(g)	Agreed
10.3.4(h)	Agreed
10.4.4(d)	Noted  As it is the current MPB which has primary responsibility for the metering installation and will have the details of the meters physically installed, we suggest that this obligation should fall on the current MPB not the MC.
10.4.4(g)	Agreed
10.5.4(d)	Noted  See comments under 10.4.4 (d)
10.5.4(g)	Agreed
15.1.4(f)	Agreed

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Table 16-C	Agreed

## 4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in yellow in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
4.3.4(c)	Noted  Although, as the LNSP may not have details for, and has not the primary responsibility for, some of these items (Manufacturer, meter model, Serial ID, GPS Coordinates etc), a number of these should be under the “may” populate heading, rather than under the “must” populate heading.
4.3.4(h)	Agreed
5.2.4(c)	Agreed
5.2.4(d)	Agreed
5.3.4(f)	Agreed
5.4.4(f)	Agreed
9.1.4(b)(iii)	Agreed

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

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in yellow in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Table 3 CATS_METER_REGISTER	Agreed
Table 6 CATS_NMI_DATA	Noted
Table 8 CATS_REGISTER_IDENTIFIER	Agreed
Table 15 Valid Meter Use Codes	Agreed
Table 16 Valid Time of Day Codes	Agreed
Section 13	Noted  Table 32 should have INTERVAL in TimeOfDay field, not ALLDAY.  Register Id should possibly be E1 not 01
Table 43 CATS_Meter_Register	Noted.  Field "Test Result" is defined as Varchar2(20), however has only 2 enumerated values, "Pass" or "Fail" (as per "Table 18"), hence could be redefined as Varchar2(4)
Table 46 CATS_NMI_Data	Noted  Field "SharedIsolationPointFlag" is an enumerated list of 4x 1 character values. Char(10) seems excessive. Char(1) seems all that is currently necessary, or Char(2) to cater for future expansion.

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Table 49 CATS_Meter_Register	Agreed
Table 52 CATS_NMI_Data	Noted

## 6. Proposed Changes in Metrology Procedure Part A

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in **yellow** in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
14. SHARED FUSE ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Noted, however:</p> <p>Under 14 (b), we believe that the primary responsibility for advising participants of Shared Fuse Arrangements should sit with the Metering Provider rather than the MC, since it is the MP who is the participant most likely to be at site, and therefore most aware of the details of the Fuse and wiring situation at the NMI.</p> <p>While the MC is responsible for co-ordinating the MP work, it is the MP which has first hand knowledge of the shared fuse arrangements at site.</p> <p>Additionally, none of the defined CATS transactions provide a mechanism for anyone other than the LNSP or ENM to advise participants of any Shared Fuse Arrangements, presumably using the "SharedIsolationPointFlag". However the CATS documentation states that the FRMP and MC</p>

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	both have responsibilities in this area, without providing a mechanism for them to meet this obligation. It is preferred that this mismatch in responsibilities and mechanisms be resolved before implementing these obligations.

## 7. Proposed Changes in Exemption Procedure Meter Installation Malfunctions

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in **yellow** in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
1.1	Agreed
2.2	Agreed
Appendix A	Agreed
Appendix B	Agreed

## 8. Proposed Changes in Retail Electricity Market Procedures - Glossary and Framework

Please provide feedback to the the changes highlighted in yellow in the change marked version of the document

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
5. GLOSSARY Shared Fuse Arrangement	Agreed

## 9. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments