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# 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.

# Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Draft Report

## Material Issues

| **Information Category** | **Question No.** | **Question** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type 4a Metering Installation (MRAM) Reason |  | 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? |  |
| Metering Installation Transformer Information |  | 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? |  |
| Shared Fuse Details |  | Through what mechanism can a MC or MP communicate with an LNSP to instigate shared isolation point status changes? |  |
| GPS Coordinates |  | 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)? |  |
|  |  | 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? |  |
|  |  | Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons. |  |
| Network Additional Information field |  | What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field? |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |
|  |  | Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field? |  |

## Data Transition

| **Information Category** | **Question No.** | **Question** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenarios |  | For Removed fields, would you prefer Option 1 (retain history) or Option 2 (remove history)? |  |
| Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields) |  | For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5? |  |
|  |  | If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii. |  |
|  |  | If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii. |  |
|  |  | If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b). |  |
|  |  | Do you have any further comment regarding the above? |  |
| Scenario 3: Amend an existing field (To Amend) |  | For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5? |  |
|  |  | If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii. |  |
|  |  | If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii. |  |
|  |  | Please provide any further details required |  |
| Outbound Notification Options |  | For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3? |  |
|  |  | Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details |  |

## Other Matters

| **Information Category** | **Question No.** | **Question** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consumer Data Right |  | Do you agree with the proposed new fields? |  |
|  |  | 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? |  |
|  |  | What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields? |  |
|  |  | Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields? |  |
|  |  | Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC’s objective? |  |
|  |  | Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC? |  |
|  |  | 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.   1. Compliance options for MPB performance for incorrectly populating NTC 2. Retailer obligations to inform the MC and MPB of the appropriate NTC 3. Network obligations to correct an incorrectly populated NTC within three business days; and or 4. 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 |  |
|  |  | Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy? |  |

# Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - WIGS

| **Section No/Field Name** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Proposed Changes in MSATS Procedures - CATS

| **Section No/Field Name** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

| **Section No/Field Name** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

| **Heading** | **Participant Comments** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |