

## 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:*** *Tasmanian Networks Pty. Ltd.*

***Completion Date:*** *5<sup>th</sup> 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 ..... 11
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter ..... 14

## 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?	TasNetworks have no comment.
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?	Is there a potential to only have the ratio in this field and a secondary field indicating the number of secondary windings?  Is it relevant that the number of secondaries is even recorded?
Shared Fuse Details	3.	Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes?	This could potentially be communicated via an existing OWN transaction or even a new transaction altogether.
GPS Coordinates	4.	Please explain the benefits for expanding the GPS coordinates field to cover all NMIs given this would be a	TasNetworks can see no benefit in providing GPS coordinates for all NMIs that would outweigh the cost of the exercise. Current

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		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)?	manual meter reading equipment used by TasNetworks does not have the ability to record GPS coordinates, therefore making the collection and population of this data a very significant and expensive exercise.
	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?	In TasNetworks' jurisdiction there is no alternate method that could be used effectively. TasNetworks' opinion is that the defined rural postcode method is the best option.
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	TasNetworks agree that having GPS coordinates would potentially allow metering points to be located with greater ease. However the process to collect and populate the information would take significant cost and effort, which in TasNetworks' opinion would outweigh any benefits.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	TasNetworks (as type 6 MPB) use this field to communicate the register circuit information and

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			the meter tariff code (which are required by the major retailer in Tasmania).
	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.	The information included in this field is partly based at register level and therefore the Meter Location field would not be appropriate, nor would any other field on the Meter Register table.
	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)?	TasNetworks' preference is Option 1. We would also prefer for CATS notifications not to be rejected if a removed field was provided.
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	TasNetworks' preference is Option 4. Please see appended Table A

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	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
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	N/A
Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend)	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	TasNetworks' preference is Option 4. Please see appended Table B
	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	N/A

---

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	TasNetworks' preference is Option 1
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	N/A

## 2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	TasNetworks agrees that the two additional fields will assist with the ability to successfully identify a customer eligible to receive data.
	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?	N/A
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	N/A
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	TasNetworks agree that the same day timeframe is appropriate for this information to be updated in MSATS.
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	N/A
	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	TasNetworks frequently sees issues with incorrect NTC's being populated by the MPB.  More than one MPB has indicated that their systems ignore inbound 3100/3101 CATS notifications and therefore any following 3051 notification is sent with out of date NTC's.



Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			TasNetworks has also observed a high number of NTC's being incorrectly allocated to new installations, which require remedial attention by TasNetworks at additional cost to the retailers and potentially the customers.
	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>TasNetworks' strong preference is option D.</p> <p>As incorrect NTC's have billing implications and resourcing impacts on the LNSP, it makes sense for the LNSP to control the population of these codes on newly installed meters/registers.</p>
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	TasNetworks also like to support the suggestion mentioned in Endeavour Energy's option 2

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			around the existing NTC being carried forward if the existing meter/register is modified.

### 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

## 6. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments

## Appendix

Table A

ADDED FIELD	DATA POPULATION OPTION
G-NAF PID	2c
Section Number	2c
DP Number	2c
Transmission Node Identifier 2	2c
House Number To	1
Meter Malfunction Exemption Number	2c
Meter Malfunction Expiry Date	2c
MRAM Reason	2c
CT Location	2a
CT Ratio	2a
CT Type	2a

CT Accuracy Class	2a
CT Last Test Date	2a
VT Location	2a
VT Ratio	2a
VT Type	2a
VT Accuracy Class	2a
VT Last Test Date	2a
Connection Configuration	2b
Shared Isolation Point Flag	1
GPS Coordinates	1

Table B

<b>AMENDED FIELD</b>	<b>DATA POPULATION OPTION</b>
Controlled Load	2a
Feeder Class	2a
Last Test Date	2b
Meter Location	2a
Meter Manufacturer	2a
Meter Model	2a
Meter Read Type Code	2b
Meter Test Result Accuracy	2b
Meter Use	2a
Next Scheduled Read Date	1
Time of Day	2a