

METERING ICF PACKAGE CHANGES

PROCEDURE CONSULTATION

FIRST STAGE PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: AGL

Submission Date: 10 Sep 2020

Table of Contents

- 1. Context 3
- 2. MSATS Procedures: CATS 4
- 3. MSATS Procedures: WIGS..... 6
- 4. Metrology Procedure: Part A..... 7
- 5. Metrology Procedure: Part B..... 8
- 6. Service Level Procedure Meter Provider Services..... 9
- 7. NEM RoLR Processes Part A and Part B..... 10
- 8. Meter Data File Format Specification..... 11
- 9. Standing Data for MSATS..... 12
- 10. Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework..... 13
- 11. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 14

1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback about the changes detailed in the initial draft procedures associated with the Metering ICF Package Changes consultation.

The changes being proposed are because of NER rule changes which have occurred requiring changes to AEMO's Retail Electricity Market Procedures and the following proposed changes by proponents and AEMO to implement recommended process improvements.

2. MSATS Procedures: CATS

Section - CATS	Description	Participant Comments
2.4.(s)	Updated to include a new sub clause(s) for obligation on MDP to provide relationship mapping between Register ID and Datastream Suffix.	Noted
2.7		Check reference link
2.9.(k)	Updated to include a different timeframe for cancelling an incomplete CR6800.	<p>Grammar – ‘incomplete change requests types if it.. - types is plural, should be ‘types if it they exceeds...’</p> <p>Suggest that for clarity the number of days be defined as calendar days – eg ‘730 <u>calendar</u> days, 220 <u>calendar</u> days ..’</p> <p>Suggest that the note be extended to refer to the report(s) that will be issued of upcoming CRs which will be cancelled and a cross reference to the report specification.</p>
4.3 Table 4-C	Updated ‘Description’ for Code ‘BADPARTY’ for current MC to object to change of MC for SMALL NMI’s only in Victoria.	<p>Noted:</p> <p>Suggest checking with Victorian DBs as there may be border crossings which are applicable, in which case the usage should be amended to the Victorian DBs Distribution areas, as opposed to a jurisdiction.</p>

Section - CATS	Description	Participant Comments																	
4.4 Table 4-D	Updated to reflect the current jurisdictional requirements for Small and Large customers.	<p>This table seems to duplicate information in the amended sections, as the jurisdiction is named in both the load column and the jurisdiction column and the definition of the MWhr limits isn't shown.</p> <p>Suggest the table could look something like this:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1012 475 1962 991"> <thead> <tr> <th>Code</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Jurisdiction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Large</td> <td>Annual Load >=100 MWh</td> <td>Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Load >=150 MWh</td> <td>Tasmania</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Load >=160 MWh</td> <td>South Australia Victoria</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Small</td> <td>Annual Load <100 MWh</td> <td>Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Load <150MWh</td> <td>Tasmania</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Load <160MWh</td> <td>South Australia Victoria</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code	Description	Jurisdiction	Large	Annual Load >=100 MWh	Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland	Annual Load >=150 MWh	Tasmania	Annual Load >=160 MWh	South Australia Victoria	Small	Annual Load <100 MWh	Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland	Annual Load <150MWh	Tasmania	Annual Load <160MWh	South Australia Victoria
Code	Description	Jurisdiction																	
Large	Annual Load >=100 MWh	Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland																	
	Annual Load >=150 MWh	Tasmania																	
	Annual Load >=160 MWh	South Australia Victoria																	
Small	Annual Load <100 MWh	Australian Capital Territory New South Wales Queensland																	
	Annual Load <150MWh	Tasmania																	
	Annual Load <160MWh	South Australia Victoria																	
12.6.3		Check Reference																	
13.3.6 Table 13-H	New entry related to objection code 'BADPARTY' for CR6300 and CR6301.	Noted																	

3. MSATS Procedures: WIGS

Section - WIGS	Description	Participant Comments
Version	Updated to align version numbering with MSATS: CATS procedures	Noted

4. Metrology Procedure: Part A

Section - Met A	Description	Participant Comments
12.5	Update to replace 'verification' with 'Validation'. Amend the section heading and introduction paragraph to better align with terminology used in SLP MP clause 4.2(b)	Noted

5. Metrology Procedure: Part B

Section – Met B	Description	Participant Comments
2.4	Update to remove 'N' Metering Data Quality Flag	Noted
13.2.2(a)(v)	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	Noted
13.3.2(a)(iii))	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	Noted
13.5.2(a)(v)	Update to remove 'End User Details' from Inventory Table. Reverse 5MS/GS changes.	Noted

6. Service Level Procedure Meter Provider Services

Section – SLP MP	Description	Participant Comments
4.2(a)(iii) & (b)	Update to replace ‘verification’ with ‘Validation’.	Noted
4.2(c)(ii) & (d)	Update to replace ‘verify’ with ‘Validate’.	Noted
4.4	Update to replace ‘verify’ with ‘confirm’.	<p>Noted</p> <p>However, there should also be a reciprocal obligation on the Current MP to take that meter reading requested by the New MP and deliver that meter reading in an appropriate timeframe.</p>
4.4(d)-(i)		Suggest that for consistency the MP named in cl (d) should be the ‘New MP’, not the ‘MP’.

7. NEM RoLR Processes Part A and Part B

Section-RoLR	Description	Participant Comments
17.2(a)	Updated to change the section from 19 to 16.	Noted
17.2(b)	Updated to include 'AEMO must' in the sub clause.	Noted
17.2(c)	Include new sub clause to remove MSATS access for the Failed Retailer.	<p>While the word 'inactivate' is legitimate, it is however generally used in other contexts, and not the system access context, and could imply that the access have atrophied, rather than being blocked.</p> <p>AGL would suggest that for broader/clearer understanding 'deactivate' would be a more commonly understood word when related to user access or in fact, use the expression 'remove access' as has been used in the consultation, as this would imply a definitive action undertaken to stop access.</p>

8. Meter Data File Format Specification

Section - MDFF	Description	Participant Comments
3.3.1(b)	Updated to remove the sub clause (b).	Noted
4.4	<p>Updated to remove the text in Definition column related to Meter Data Quality Flag 'N' against the Field InternalValue1....InternalValueN</p> <p>Updated to remove 'N' from Allowed Values against the Fields QualityMethod and ReasonCode</p> <p>Updated to remove the text in Definition column related to Quality Flag 'N' against Field UpdateDateTime</p>	Noted
4.5	Updated to remove 'N' from Allowed Values against the Fields QualityMethod and ReasonCode	Noted
Appendix C	Update to remove the row related to Quality flag 'N'.	Noted

9. Standing Data for MSATS

Section – Standing Data	Description	Participant Comments
8.1	Amend the description of Average Daily Load in Table 15	Noted
9.1	Amend the description of RegisterID in Table 18	Noted

10. Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework

Section - Glossary	Description	Participant Comments
5	Amend definition of the term Average Daily Load (ADL).	Noted

11. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading - Other	Participant Comments
Are there better options to accommodate the change proposals, that better achieve the required objectives? What are the pros and cons of these options? How would they be implemented?	No other options have been identified at this time.
What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?	