

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: CitiPower Powercor

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 10
- 4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter..... 13

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?	This matter is not relevant in Victoria.
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?	<p>CitiPower Powercor recommends the more valuable information to capture is the availability of alternative tappings on HV & LV Current Transformers so that different and more suitable ratios can be implemented, for example; 200-400/5A. However, the most important information is to know the connected ratios rather than available ratios.</p> <p>The presence of dual secondary windings on VT's is of less value, particularly if these are not metering class and already used for other purposes, similarly these could be presented as 500k/110-110V.</p>

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>For a site requiring identification and operation of shared fusing CitiPower Powercor recommends that the MP/MC is to notify FRMP to send SO to LNSP to investigate and scope work and then update shared fusing flag on effected NMI's.</p> <p>If a MC/MP then installs individual isolation to a specific NMI during that shared fusing DNSP outage, it is best that the NOMW be amended to allow the MP to advise the DNSP through that process, allowing the DNSP to remove the shared fusing flag on that NMI.</p> <p>MC/MP's are also obliged in some jurisdictions (i.e. NSW) to install a Meter Isolation Device with 80A rating, where the individual fusing of the LNSP SPD is >80A, and the NOMW should also advise the LNSP of that installation as it may be the cause of a supply outage.</p>
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 to have elevation for which floor (assuming metering on each unit)?	<p>CitiPower Powercor supports providing GPS coordinates for all sites installed from the commencement date of this obligation but does not support this being retrospective, i.e. that it applies to all existing sites.</p> <p>We also don't believe you need to distinguish the floor number with a different GPS coordinate for each floor, the tenancy address should confirm the floor. 3D coordinates would require far more</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			complex data capture and record storage for very minor benefit.
	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?	CitiPower Powercor supports the use of DLF's to distinguish between rural and urban NMIs, i.e. rural short, rural long, urban short and urban long. This may then need that to be an attribute recorded against the NMI
	6.	Do you agree with AEMO proposal? If yes, why? If no, why not? Please provide reasons.	CitiPower Powercor does not support AEMO's proposal to use 'Designated regional area postcodes' as we believe the use of DLF's is a more accurate and is the existing industry standard to distinguish between rural and urban areas/suburbs.
Network Additional Information field	7.	What uses do participants (retailers, networks and metering parties) have for the Network Additional Information field?	CitiPower Powercor does 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.	N/A
	9.	Do you agree with retaining the Network Additional Information field?	CitiPower Powercor does not have a position on retaining this field other than we don't want it becoming mandatory or required.

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)?	CitiPower Powercor supports option 2 but for records such as unstructured addresses we would request an extract of these before they are deleted to assist with updating the structured address.
Scenario 2: Add a new field (Proposed Fields)	11.	For Added fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4 or 5?	CitiPower Powercor supports option 2a ii. We don't envisage too many instances of data being bulk uploaded for new fields. We may have data for some but don't intend to retrospectively collect and update new fields, these will be updated as we visit sites as part of our BAU activity.
	12.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	
	13.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	
	14.	If you choose Option 2c, please choose between for i(a) or i(b).	
	15.	Do you have any further comment regarding the above?	
Scenario 3: Amend an	16.	For Amended fields, would you prefer Option 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4 or 5?	CitiPower Powercor supports option 2a ii. We don't envisage too many instances of data being bulk uploaded for amended fields. We may have

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
existing field (To Amend)			data for some but don't intend to retrospectively collect and update amended fields, these will be updated as we visit sites as part of our BAU activity.
	17.	If you choose Option 2a, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii.	
	18.	If you choose Option 2b, please choose between i(a) or i(b) and provide answers for ii and iii.	
	19.	Please provide any further details required	
Outbound Notification Options	20.	For Outbound Notifications, would you prefer Option 1, 1a, 2, or 3?	CitiPower Powercor supports option 2.
	21.	Do you have an alternate method of receiving Outbound Notifications? If so, please provide details	No

2.3 Other Matters

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Consumer Data Right	22.	Do you agree with the proposed new fields?	CitiPower Powercor does not have a position as this matter is not applicable to our business.
	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?	NA
	24.	What sorts of consequences – including potential unintended consequences – may need to be considered in respect of these fields?	NA
	25.	Do you agree with the timeframe for updating the data in these fields?	NA
	26.	Are there other suggestions to help meet the ACCC's objective?	NA
Network Tariff Code (NTC)	27.	Given this change commenced on 1 December 2017, to what extent are you seeing issues with the population of the NTC?	We are dealing with approximately 20-40 exceptions each month.
	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> <p>a) Compliance options for MPB performance for incorrectly populating NTC</p> <p>b) Retailer obligations to inform the MC and MPB of the appropriate NTC</p>	CitiPower Powercor is supportive of option D, but the obligation would only be applicable from when the MPB has updated MSATS and not just sent NOMW. At a minimum, the LNSP should have 5 business days to update the NTC after the MPB has updated MSATS.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		c) Network obligations to correct an incorrectly populated NTC within three business days; and or 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	
	29.	Do you have any comments on the options provided by Endeavour Energy?	CitiPower Powercor supports option 1 proposed by Endeavour Energy.

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