

## 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: Powermetric Metering*

*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 ..... 9
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 12

## 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?	Powermetric have zero Type 4A installations and therefore do not experience any issues in this regard.
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?	A single secondary will be sufficient. FYI - Powermetric asset register does not cater for dual secondaries.
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	Powermetric would prefer to just allow MC's and MP's update this field.
GPS Coordinates	4.	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	Powermetric have assumed that the NMI location would be the same as the meter location?

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?	If so then the description plus the GPS Coordinates are sufficient. Powermetric believe there is no need to expand this field.
	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?	Powermetric does not support the notion that GPS should only be needed for rural areas and we intend to input GPS coordinates for all meter locations as this information is very useful no matter which region the meter is located in.
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	No – Powermetric's believe that GPS coordinates are extremely useful particularly for large C&I and SME sites no matter which region the meter is located in.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	Nil – as Powermetric do not use this field.
	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 with expanded characters.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	9.	Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field?	No – Not used by Powermetric

## 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)?	Option 2
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	Option 3
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	N/A
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	N/A
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	N/A

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	Nil
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	Option 3
	17.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	N/A
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	N/A
	19.	Please provide any further details required	Prefer for new field to be created rather than repurposing existing fields.
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	Option 1a
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	Should consider C4 report.

## 2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	Yes
	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?	No comment
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	No comment
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	No comment
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	Nil
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	As MPB's do not have a direct relationship with NTC's and therefore not best placed to update them. This has caused numerous instances where incorrect NTC's have been used by the MPB.
	28.	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.	Option D.  This allows for the MPB to inform the LNSP of the metering configuration which then allows

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		<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>	the LNSP to correctly select and update the NTC.
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	We strongly support Endeavour Energy proposal to allow MPB to enter the meter register record without an NTC.



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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

## 4. Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

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

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments
Section 11 – Reference Tables Table 14	These fields do not appear to cater for numerous HV CT's cases such as 50:5 or any 1-amp secondary CTs. If the fields in Table 43 are free text, then this is not an issue.

## 6. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments