

## MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- MSATS Procedures – WIGS
- MSATS Procedures – CATS
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline
- Retail Electricity Market Procedures  
Glossary & Framework

## CONSULTATION – Draft Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant: AGL***

***Completion Date: 5 June 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 ..... 21
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 24

## 1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback to the questions raised in the Draft Report about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data.

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

### 2.1 Material Issues

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Type 4a Metering Installation (MRAM) Reason	1.	What are the key issues for AEMO to consider in working with stakeholders to explore with the AEMC the potential benefits of enhanced access to exception information?	Please note AGL comment regarding the categorisation of the Exemption field. If the submission of the exemption by the MC has an associated category, then type 4A exemptions for telecommunications can be made via the portal, in the same way that other exemption requests can be made.
Metering Installation Transformer Information	2.	In the cases where transformers have dual secondary windings or more (500kV : 110V : 110V), how would participants prefer to see those represented in the enumerated list for VT Ratio, keeping in mind that a transformer can have up to five secondary windings?	As long as the information is consistently formatted so it can be understood effectively by agents and processed by IT systems, AGL has no preference on the nature of the format.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	<p>There are multiple mechanisms, which would depend on the volume of data, ranging from an e-mail to a transactional mechanism to a CR to update MSATS.</p> <p>AGL does not strongly support e-mail, as this mechanism of communication is less secure and heavily reliant on manual processes, and often specific people. Rather AGL would prefer a more transactional approach to this form of data sharing.</p> <p>Equally, AGL does not think that a CR is the best solution. There was discussion about recording which NMIs have a shared fuse. As such, it is likely that the DBs will need to review that data sets prior to updating MSATS, especially if other information such as the second NMI is identified and cross referenced.</p> <p>For this reason, as an option, AGL suggests the MC could send a Misc Service Order (with an agreed structure) to the network to evaluate and update MSATS as a way of making the process transactional and ensuring transactional and business receipts are managed, and can ensure that the activity is placed in the DB workflows.</p>

<p>GPS Coordinates</p>	<p>4.</p>	<p>Please explain the benefits for expanding the GPS coordinates field to cover all NMIs given this would be a significant cost? For example, some multi-floor buildings would have the same GPS coordinates so you may also need to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?</p>	<p>First, in terms of broad data capture – the meter databases will need to be modified to capture GPS coordinates for all meters, and managing validations on rural/urban meters may also cause issues (assuming urban also encapsulates small towns etc as opposed to major cities).</p> <p>If there is too much flexibility in the proposed definitions then AGL could see various mismatches, eg one DB records a supply meter 50 m from the town edge, but another wont record a meter within 1 km.</p> <p>As urbanisation grows, a meter which was captured when it was rural, may be ignored on exchange, because the town boundary has shifted. As such, AGL would strongly urge that once GPS coordinates are captured, they must be maintained, regardless of urban / rural definitions.</p> <p>AGL would also suggest that there is great value in capturing GPS coordinates of UMS connections, traffic lights, street-light connections etc where there is no associated address. AGL does not believe that this aspect was considered during the initial consultation.</p> <p>GPS coordinates in multilevel buildings (together with other NMI locational data (eg floor)) will assist in locating meters.</p> <p>Lastly, the cost of implementing this change has been argued to be the database structures and issuing GPS equipment to field staff. Once those changes are implemented, then then capturing urban meter locations is more incremental and the process more automated / BAU. Further, there would be no need to then consider whether data must be captured, as all areas would qualify.</p> <p>AGL would consider that the data collection obligation could be the first 12 months in rural areas, and 24 months for urban areas would be reasonable (effectively allowing parties year 2 for the urban data capture, thus minimising capital equipment costs).</p> <p>AGL understands that there may also be some consideration of the costs of capturing type 4 meters previously installed. AGL would suggest that while those</p> <p>If all location are captured, then the definition of urban / rural is moot.</p>
------------------------	-----------	---	---

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	5.	AEMO has applied the definition of rural using the 'Designated regional area postcodes' to gain consistency in approach, however feedback indicates a mixed response to this option. Is there an alternate NEM wide definition that can be applied across the NEM? AEMO notes, for example, in Queensland NMIs are required to be classified as urban, short rural and long rural for Guaranteed Service Levels. Is there something similar to this in other jurisdictions and can it be applied there?	<p>AGL has no particular position on what is designated Rural or Urban, as long as it is consistently approached, noting that whatever definition is used will most likely have some default areas which are urban in a rural postcode or rural in an urban post code (eg small townships or estates).</p> <p>AGL would suggest that where there is variation, that the obligation errs on the side of capturing the data.</p> <p>See comments in Q 4 regarding consistent approach to boundaries and maintenance of GPS coordinates once captured.</p>
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	<p>AGL notes the comment, but would seek clarity on what constitutes rural and urban; Further, AGL sees the GPS coordinates assisting with locating meters and connections not directly on a property – eg traffic lights, UMS connections, rural pumps etc.</p> <p>As such, AGL thinks that greater benefit will accrue by not separating the requirement for urban and rural.</p> <p>In saying that, AGL suggests that data capture could be prioritised over a period, such as 12 months for rural and 24 months for urban.</p> <p>AGL would also suggest, that as some DBs and MCs may already have GPS coordinates (eg Vic DBs) for urban meter locations, that these be required to be populated so that the largest population of information is developed.</p>
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	Given the upcoming change sin DER and other network activities, AGL suggest that this field may be useful for additional information relating to Network activities.

---

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	8.	Are there other fields that may be suitable to apply this information? For example, Meter Location field with an increased character length available for the field.	Meter location field should be extended as this will assist with the removal of information from other fields.
	9.	Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field?	Yes

## 2.2 Data Transition

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Scenarios	10.	For Removed fields, would you prefer Option 1 (retain history) or Option 2 (remove history)?	<p>In general, AGL would suggest that Option 1 (retaining the fields for historical data) be the initial data transition point. AGL would suggest that in an agreed period (eg 5 years) those fields could then be removed.</p> <p>If the fields are to be removed, then AGL would suggest that the information be retained in some way which could be retrieved relatively easily.</p>
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	<p>AGL notes that there are various options for updating these fields, but the preferred choice will also be dependent on the mechanisms used to update participants.</p> <p>AGL suggests that a working group (eg SWG/ITDF) be utilised to develop the most efficient data update mechanism for participants.</p> <p>See Q20.</p>
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	See Q11
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	See Q11
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	See Q11
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	See Q11



Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	<p>For fields where data is to be amended, the current records should be copied and made available (like the deleted information) and then emptied.</p> <p>The updating process could then follow the same process used for new fields, thus maintaining a consistent process which could be used for all data updates.</p>
	17.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	See Q 16
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	See Q 16
	19.	Please provide any further details required	See Q 16

<p>Outbound Notification Options</p>	<p>20.</p>	<p>For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?</p>	<p>AGL notes the provided options and considers that resolving this matter quickly is perhaps a key aspect to the proposed changes for both this NMI Standing Data consultation and the proposed changes for 5ms / Global.</p> <p>AGL expects that there will be more data changes than have currently identified for NMI standing Data and 5ms / Global and that development of the data updating mechanisms need to be developed.</p> <p>As such, AGL strongly suggests that AEMO and industry work together via the SWG/ITDF etc to develop the data roadmap for the NEM retail market as a high priority and put in place mechanisms to ensure data integrity at all stages of the process. To this end AGL suggests that such an initial meeting be organised as soon as possible to establish the most efficient mechanisms for industry.</p> <p>AGL believes that the outcomes of these decisions impacts the 5ms/global settlements project as much as the NMI Standing Data project, and in particular, some timeframes associated with Standing data changes for the 5ms/global project could be reviewed and updated once the decision on data management is made.</p> <p>Noting that many participant processes (especially those relating to customers) are triggered by CRs, AGL suggests that this form of data interchange cannot cease as yet.</p> <p>However, as part of the proposed MSATS data Changes, and the implementation of 5ms/Global, there are expected to be a substantial number of bulk data updates ongoing for some years, such as meter reconfigurations from 30m to 5m.</p> <p>For this reason, AGL considers that data updates would need to be a mix of bulk updates, which are probably best handled via a Data Interchange or Infoserver mechanism with CRs handling low volume and customer updates.</p> <p>AGL is unclear about further detail associated with the Data Interchange proposal, such as the provision of a data model and data scripts, however, AGL is assuming these would be provided for efficiency purposes.</p>
--------------------------------------	------------	--	---

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			<p>As such, AGL would suggest that many of these updates (eg GPS coordinates) etc be managed as bulk updates scheduled to be run on weekends, and the information provided through the Data Interchange style process on the weekends. For example, data is uploaded by participants to AEMO Friday, Saturday AEMP processes data and downloads it to participants, which leaves Sundays for Participants to process the data within their internal systems.</p> <p>This would leave the existing MarketNet bandwidth to manage the BAU CR processes during the week.</p>
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	AGL is aware that some consideration has been given to a central Standing Data Repository, which AGL supports, and which would remove the notification issue.

## 2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	AGL does not support the addition of new fields until the ACCC has finalised its own processes and resolved the customer consent and authorisation processes for energy. AEMO should be making 'no regrets' changes to MSATS with respect to CDR needs. This change is not a 'no regrets' proposal as the final designation instrument and ACCC Rules may result in a consumer consent and authentication model that does not require such changes. This may result in industry and AEMO incurring costs for building system changes that do not support the end CDR framework for energy that would need to be unwound/redefined. This therefore is not in the interests of the consumer who may wear unnecessary costs.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	23.	What types of scenarios – including specific examples – could be envisaged which would raise complexities whose resolution would be required in order to achieve the data sharing objectives?	<p>What constitutes churn is an important question in the CDR context.</p> <p>Treasury is currently consulting on the draft designation instrument for energy where the term ‘associate’ has been used to extend CDR to those that are not the primary account holder of the electricity arrangement. It is therefore important that changes to MSATS is done on the need as defined by final CDR Rules set by the ACCC, for example – what would constitute churn from a CDR perspective (e.g. if someone is an associate and/or authorised on the account and changes retailers on behalf of the household). These matters are yet to be consulted on by the ACCC and we caution against seeking amendments until further clarity is available.</p> <p>AGL notes that customers can also technically change retailers and then return to their previous retailer (for example, this may occur due to a customer change of mind during a cooling-off period). As such, the change flag/date would have to be unwound (and would need to be appropriately time-stamped).</p> <p>However, what this looks like will again depend on the ACCC position on matters such as corrections of CDR data which will occur under the CDR Rules. We note that these changes to the previous retailer can be processed up to 12 or more months, as a result of an incorrect customer churn.</p> <p>The AEMO faster transfers process (which has been delayed) will also need to be considered.</p> <p>As AEMO is responsible for managing the MSATS systems and Standing Data repositories. In the interests of managing customer churn information efficiently, AGL would expect that AEMO would manage the changes, updates and reversals of any change associated with a FRMP change in the standing data, and a FRMP would not be required to provide an update to AEMO for those situations, as those changes are a direct outcome of an MSATS records.</p> <p>AGL would only expect to provide data where there was a customer churn, but not a FRMP churn, and where that account holder churn matches the ACCC requirements.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	<p>The CDR data and consents model is built on a foundation of strong consumer protections. We have concerns that these flags may be used to support a model of lesser consumer consent (e.g. the AEMO resident model) which we believe may undermine the CDR process.</p> <p>For example, it may encourage third party providers to only display/promote data access that is under this lesser ‘resident’ model, and therefore consumers may forgo other data (e.g. billing data) that may provide a more accurate assessment of what the retailer may gain / lose by changing retailers and/or products. As this ties in with customer provided data, such as concessional information, discounts, eligibility etc, this is important information that may result in consumer detriment if not properly managed.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	<p>AGL does not support the proposed timeframe (0 days) being proposed by AEMO. We do not believe that a same-day approach is appropriate for retailers to deliver.</p> <p>AEMO has not provided any clarity as to the need for an urgent update on the day a retailer receives the advice. Such an obligation will create significant resource burdens on our staff and is not practical. We also note that such an approach will likely lead to further updates where information needs to be corrected or reverted.</p> <p>A change of account holder has a number of validations which must be considered. For example, concession eligibility can result in retailer advice to customers that a name change may not be advisable as the current account-holder may be a concession card holder, and the proposed new account-holder does not have a concession card.</p> <p>AGL also again reiterates that it should only be responsible for customer changes which <b>do not</b> include FRMP changes, and that AEMO should be responsible for managing FRMP changes as the system managing that FRMP change is the same system that the FRMP change would need to be recorded in.</p> <p>AGL would propose that the information be updated in 5 business days (consistent with other MSATS NMI Standing Data changes, such as meter exchange) once the account holder has changed (noting the definition of account holder should match the CDR definition in these circumstances). We believe this matter needs to be considered in the context of the final CDR Rules to ensure consistency.</p>
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	No comment.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	<p>Broadly, AGL has put in place various processes to manage the application of the appropriate NTC. Nevertheless, AGL is aware of errors which occur as a result of the multiple parties involved in NTC nomination and understanding of which NTC is appropriate, given various network updates to NTCs.</p> <p>AGL is supportive of the proposal and has no objection to the Networks being responsible for the application of the NTC, understanding that AGL can always negotiate with the Network if AGL believes a more appropriate NTC should be used, as is done now.</p> <p>AGL would expect the new process to continue much like it does now, with the Retailer nominating an NTC on the meter forms but the Network nominating the NTC rather than the MC.</p>



Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	28.	<p>If AEMO was to review the obligations on NTC, out of the options proposed, which do you see being the most effective to address the current issues experienced. Please provide reasons as to why you think the options you've chosen would address the issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Compliance options for MPB performance for incorrectly populating NTC</li> <li>b) Retailer obligations to inform the MC and MPB of the appropriate NTC</li> <li>c) Network obligations to correct an incorrectly populated NTC within three business days; and or</li> <li>d) If networks are provided the obligation to populate NTC then they will have only three business days to correctly populate this after the metering installation details are provided by the MPB, this will ensure there are not additional delays to the commissioning of the meter in MSATS</li> </ul>	<p>AGL considers Option D to be the most efficient outcome, with Option C as a fallback option for Option D.</p> <p>Options C and D both have a 3-day SLA, which is good. However, Option C is more exception based, which is less than ideal.</p> <p>Tariff selection can be complex in some situations and implementing a compliance process can be quite onerous. AGL suggest that it is far better for the industry to put its energy into resolving the issue than record that there is an error. AGL does not support either Option A or B.</p> <p>Networks and Retailers have existing processes to address issues which may arise between themselves.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	We agree with the comments provided by Endeavour that the NTC field should be the responsibility of the LNSP and we support their proposed option. However, Option 1 seems to be a practical approach and is aligned with Option D in the previous question.
Meter Exemption Process		Meter Exemption Process	<p>Expanding on AGLs response within the first round of submissions, AGL believes that a short enumerated categorisation of meter faults could be developed between AEMO and the MCs and would make the process of managing exemptions more efficient for participants. These categorisations might look something like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meter Failure</li> <li>• Family Failure</li> <li>• CT Fault</li> <li>• HV VT/CT Fault</li> <li>• Damaged Display</li> <li>• Comms Failure</li> <li>• No Communications Available</li> <li>• Asbestos</li> <li>• Customer Defect</li> <li>• Customer Reschedule</li> <li>• Other (not categorised)</li> </ul> <p>Etc</p> <p>AGL suggests that a combination of meter type and categorisation will allow participants to build the processes into workflows and to focus on those faults which have a high impact.</p>

			<p>Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>&gt; Unable to Isolate</li><li>&gt; Equipment not found</li><li>&gt; Customer defect - level 2 Defect</li><li>&gt; Retailer Cancellation - Not Same day</li><li>&gt; Unsupported B2B Service Order</li><li>&gt; Unable to clarify existing meter number/s</li><li>&gt; Unable to perform customer consultation or arrange appt.</li><li>&gt; Customer requested reschedule</li><li>&gt; No room on switchboard</li><li>&gt; Customer contact details incorrect</li><li>&gt; Field technician missed scheduled work order</li><li>&gt; Unable to locate Site (NMI)</li><li>&gt; Incorrect Retailer determined on site</li><li>&gt; Customer defect - Level 1 Defect</li><li>&gt; Incorrect Retailer (detected via Scheduling)</li><li>&gt; Field Tech not qualified and Re-attemptable.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--



### 3. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	N/A - Procedures will be reviewed in the next round

#### 4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	N/A - Procedures will be reviewed in the next round

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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
	N/A - Procedures will be reviewed in the next round

## 6. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments
	See below



## 7. Comments on Specific Data Items

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Last Test Date	Field definition to be clarified to refer to testing only and the field be made 'Required'. Data quality to be maintained by validating it according to date format.	per AGL initial Submission – Support
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Test Result Accuracy	Field to be made 'Required' and renamed from. 'Meter Test Result Accuracy' to 'Meter Test Result'. The field will be enumerated to indicate Pass or Fail.	per AGL initial Submission – Support
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Manufacturer	Field to be made 'Mandatory' with an itemised list of regular compulsory updates.	per AGL initial Submission – Support
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Model	Field to be made 'Mandatory' with an itemised list of regular compulsory updates.	per AGL initial Submission – Support

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Read Type Code	Field made 'Mandatory' and fourth character to identify whether meter capable of reading at five-minute granularity.	<p>Per AGL initial Submission – Support.</p> <p>However, the AEMO proposal does not cater for 1 min meter intervals – which has been suggested would be needed for the implementation of some DER proposals.</p> <p>AGL suggests that the enumerations cater for 1,5,10,15 and 30 min data capture rates – ie A=1, B=5, C=10, D=15, E=30</p> <p>Noting that 15 min meters will not be removed for 5 ms and 1 min is a valid selection under 5ms.</p> <p>AGL is unclear if there are any 10 min meters, but they would be a valid meter where the information was aggregated and provided at 30 min or divided and provided at 5 ms.</p>
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Suffix	No change, AEMO notes that this field has always been 'Mandatory' and no change is required here.	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Amend	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Use	Field to be made 'Required' with an enumerated list of values	Per AGL initial submission – Support

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Asset Management Plan	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Calibration Tables	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Constant	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Point	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Program	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Route	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Test & Calibration Program	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Test Result Notes	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Next Test Date	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	General Metering Installation Information	Test Performed By	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Disconnection Method	Field not to be added	AGL does not support this. As per our original submission, it is possible for a NMI to be Disconnected in multiple ways (Tails, Fuse, Pillar/Pit and Pole), whereas it is not possible to disconnect the registers in multiple ways.
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Commission Date	Field not to be added	AGL supported use of this field, but it is additional information.
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Locks	Field not to be added	AGL notes the Draft Decision, but understands that the number of jobs affected by locks may be of a greater order than those affected by shared fuses. The rejection of this proposed information arose from Networks who would have been the providers, not the predominant users.
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Minimum interval length	Field not to be added	Per AGL initial submission – Support
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Family Failure	Field not to be added	AGL notes the proposal within the meter exemption comments and suggests that this information can be managed through that process.
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Meter Test Report	Field not to be added	Per AGL initial submission – Support

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
Proposed Field	General Metering Installation Information	Plug-in Meter Flag	Field not to be added	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Amend	Register Level Information	Controlled Load	Make field with enumerated list	Per AGL initial submission – Support  Although categorisation of controlled load as CL1, CL2 etc is limited. AGL also queries how this information may operate with Demand Response Controlled Load – which may require DC1, DC2 etc
To Amend	Register Level Information	Time of Day	Make field with enumerated list	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Register Level Information	Demand 1	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Register Level Information	Demand 2	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Metering Installation Location Information	Additional Site Information	Field to be removed and contents moved to the existing field Meter	Noted
To Amend	Metering Installation Location Information	Meter Location	Increase field size to accommodate data from Additional Site Information	Noted

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
To Amend	Meter Read Estimation Information	Next Scheduled Read Date	Modify field from 'Optional' to 'Required' for all manually read meters	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Read Estimation Information	Data Validations	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Read Estimation Information	Estimation Instructions	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Read Estimation Information	Measurement Type	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	Communications Equipment Type	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	Communication Protocol	Field to be removed	Noted
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	Data Conversion	Field to be removed	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	Password	Field to be removed	Noted
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	Remote Phone Number	Field to be removed	Noted
To Remove	Meter Communications Information	User Access Rights	Field to be removed	Noted

Change Type	Information Category	Field Name	AEMO's Conclusion	Draft Comment
To Remove	Address Structure	Unstructured Address	Field to be removed	AGL notes the Draft Decision, but strongly re-iterates that unstructured should be retained to manage special locations (eg generator sites, UMS sites, rural sites etc) which are not supported by a structured address.
Proposed Field	Address Structure	G-NAF PID	Field to be added	Per AGL initial submission – Support
To Amend	Feeder Class	Feeder Class	Field to be made 'Required' for Queensland	Per AGL initial submission – Support
Proposed Field	Transmission Node Identifier 2	Transmission Node Identifier 2	Field to be added	Per AGL initial submission – Support
Propose To Remove	NER Schedule 7.1	Loss compensation calculation details	Field to be proposed to be removed from Schedule 7.1.2	Noted – Agree
Propose To Remove	NER Schedule 7.1	Data register coding details	Field to be proposed to be removed from Schedule 7.1.2	Noted – Agree
Propose To Remove	NER Schedule 7.1	Write' password (to be contained in a hidden or protected field)	Field to be proposed to be removed from Schedule 7.1.2	Noted – Agree