

MSATS Standing Data Review

- MSDR Issues Paper
- Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Alinta Energy

Completion Date: 31 March 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 13
- 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 issues paper about the proposed changes to the MSATS Standing Data.

2. Questions raised in the MSATS Standing Data Review Issues Paper

2.1 Metering Installation Information

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
General Metering Installation Information	1.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Number field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Alinta Energy strongly supports the addition of this field.
	2.	Do you support the addition of the Meter Malfunction Exemption Expiry Date field to MSATS? If not, why not?	Alinta Energy supports the addition of this field.
	3.	If you do not support the addition of the suggested fields, do you support the addition of the Meter Family Failure field?	NA
	4.	If you do not support the amendments proposed by AEMO, which ones and why?	NA

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	5.	What enumerations can be made for the Meter Use codes that would be useful for the market?	The proposes codes with the addition of a Private/Non Billing/customer enumeration would be useful for the market.
	6.	<p>There are several existing fields that AEMO proposes removing from MSATS Standing Data. Do you see any value in their retention for the market? If so, please outline it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meter Constant may be a relevant field for older equipment as it refers to intrinsic constraint of meter in Wh/pulse. Is there value to this field for the market and if so is there another field that the constant could be listed in? 	<p>Alinta Energy supports the removal of the MSATS fields.</p> <p>AdditionalSiteInformation – O - MPB</p> <p>AssetManagementPlan – O – MPB</p> <p>CalibrationTables – O – MPB</p> <p>CommunicaionsEquipmentType – O – MPB</p> <p>CommunicationsProtocol – O – MPB</p> <p>DataConversion – O – MPB</p> <p>DataValidations – O – MPB</p> <p>EstimationInstruments – O – MPB</p> <p>Contant – O – MPB</p> <p>Point – O/M – MPB</p> <p>Program – O – MPB</p> <p>Route – O – MPB</p> <p>NextTestDate – O – MPB</p> <p>Password – O – MPB</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			RemotePhoneNumber – O – MPB TestCalibrationProgam – O – MPB TestPerformedBy – O – MPB TestResultAccuracy – O – MPB TestReslutNotes – O – MPB TransformerLocation – O – MPB TransfromerType – O – MPB UserAccessRights – O – MPB DeliveryPointIdentifier – O – LNSP AddressLine – O – LNSP
	7.	A majority of workshop attendees did not support the inclusion of the aforementioned industry-proposed fields as they would not provide value to the market as a whole. Are any of them worth further consideration? If so, why and what value do they add to the market?	It is not clear to Alinta Energy what question AEMO is asking here? Assuming this is requesting if there are any additional items that we would like to be consider and why see below responses; <u>Solar and battery flags</u> Alinta understands that currently this information is captured under the relevant DER obligations however, we believe there is fundamental value to both retailers and customers in having this information available in standing data. This would enable retailers to provide

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			<p>innovative products and services to customers based on their site-specific needs and help us be able to offer future services and support initiatives under demand side participation that is not readily available to us currently. This would also help customers access products and pricing tailored to their home as we have no way of identifying or knowing if there is solar or battery and the size of the units currently without customers providing this proactively, it is also worth noting networks have this information available.</p> <p><u>Life support</u></p> <p>During the consultation pertaining to life support in 2018, AEMO was given the task of exploring the long-term solution for life support via a central repository option and was requested by the IEC to review whether it could support this intuitive in line with CDR and other like changes. Having the ability to identify, manage and update life support in a market facing system would support all market participants activities and ensure adequate customer protections where identifiable. This would not contain sensitive data or customer information but would simply be a flag indicating the current registration status relevant at the site.</p>

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	8.	Do you have any other comments regarding the general Metering Installation Information fields?	NA
Metering Installation Transformer Information	9.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to splitting transformer information into CT and VT?	Alinta Energy agrees with AEMO's proposal to split the transformer information into separate fields for CT's and VT's.
	10.	Do you agree to AEMO's proposal with regards to adding new transformer information fields which includes: CT/VT Accuracy Class, CT/VT Last Test Date?	Alinta Energy supports the addition of these fields.
	11.	Do you agree with the validations proposed by AEMO for the transformer information fields? If not, please provide other types of validations that can be applied.	Alinta Energy does not have an opinion on what this field should contain as it is a field that it is unlikely to use.
	12.	Do you agree to not to add CT/VT serial number fields, and if you do not agree, can you propose solutions for adding those fields in (i.e. new NMI devices table) and will adding them provide more benefit than costs to your business and customers	Alinta Energy agrees to not including transformer serial numbers in MSATS. If we require this information, then we can obtain it from the relevant MC/MPB.
Register Level Information	13.	Do you agree with amending the fields Controlled Load and Time of Day to include enumerated list of values? If Yes, what values can be in the enumerated list for the fields: - Controlled Load	Alinta Energy supports the changing of the Controlled Load and Time of Day fields to an enumerated list of values.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		- Time of Day	The Controlled Load enumerated list should be consistence with the B2B enumerations.
	14.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the following fields? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand1 - Demand2 - Network Additional Information 	Alinta Energy supports the removal of the MSATS fields.
Connection and Metering point Details	15.	Do you agree with the proposal to include the Connection Configuration field as described above? Why/why not?	Alinta Energy supports the inclusion of a Connection Configuration field. This field will allow for a quick assessment of what configuration of the connection point is. Alinta Energy proposes that a fifth character is considered, for Expected energy flows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B - if bi-directional energy flow • I – for Energy flowing from the Customer to the Network • E – for Energy flowing from the network to the customer.
	16.	Are there any connection configurations that could not be contained in the above Connection Configuration field?	Alinta Energy does not believe that it is best placed to provide AEMO with this advice and will defer to the LSNP's for this information.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Shared Isolation Points Flag Field	17.	Are the values sufficient? What additional information should be provided, and how could it be validated?	Alinta Energy supports the proposed Y, N and Unknown.
	18.	Should "Unknown" be able to be changed into "Yes" / "No"?	Alinta Energy supports that this is a mandatory field and understands that there may be many sites with an "Unknown" status initially, however when the LNSP becomes aware of the status either through notification from other participants or other means, then there should be an expectation for this information to be updated and the Unknown be changed to a Y or a N.
Metering Installation Location Information	19.	Do you support the deletion of Additional Site Information?	Alinta Energy supports the removal of the MSATS fields
	20.	Are there any pieces of information that would be useful to explicitly flag for inclusion in the Meter Location field? (these can be included in the definition of the field)	No further info needs.
	21.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for all rural sites?	Alinta Energy supports the capturing of GPS coordinates for all installation.
	22.	If the provision of GPS coordinates for all rural NMIs were made mandatory, does your organisation support the use of "Designated regional area postcodes" to define "rural"? If not, what alternative would your organisation prefer?	Alinta Energy proposes that this field be Mandatory for all sites. Alita Energy proposes that a GPS coordinate of 0's be used where this information is unavailable and AEMO monitors MPB's as part of its regular audit regime

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
			to ensure that MPB's are appropriately populating this field.
	23.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any sites with an MRIM meter?	See answer to question 22
	24.	Does your organisation support the mandatory provision of GPS coordinates for any new installations?	See answer to question 22
	25.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made mandatory for any other scenarios?	See answer to question 22
	26.	Does your organisation believe that the provision of this information should be made required for any other scenarios?	See answer to question 22
	27.	Bearing in mind that GPS coordinates to four decimal places allow identification to the nearest 10 metres, that GPS coordinates to five decimal places allows identification to the nearest metre, and that GPS coordinates to six decimal places allows identification to the nearest 10 centimetres, if the field is added should it be to four, five, or six decimal places?	Alinta Energy believes that 4 decimals should provide enough resolution.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Meter Read and Estimation Information	28.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to amend or remove the meter read and estimation information as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Alinta Energy agrees to the removal of the field EstimationInstructions. Note it has not be struckthrough on page 17 of the document Standing Data for MSATS v 5.1.
Meter Communications Information	29.	Do you agree with AEMO's proposal to remove the meter communications information fields as per the proposal above, if not please specify which ones you do not agree with and why?	Alinta Energy agrees to the removal of this field.

2.2 NMI details

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
Address Structure	30.	Do you agree with the proposal to remove unstructured address fields, following a period for data holders to clean their existing data?	Alinta Energy strongly supports the removal of unstructured address fields on MSATS.
	31.	Are there any reasons to keep the Unstructured Address fields, given that additional locational information (e.g. "pump by the dam") can be provided in other fields, e.g. Location Descriptor where we have proposed to lengthen the characters available?	Alinta Energy agrees that the lengthening of the Location Descriptor field should ensure that Unstructured Address fields can be removed from MSATS.

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
	32.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated by AEMO on the basis of structured address (as is currently done for DPIDs) and thereafter by LNSPs?	Alinta Energy supports AEMO adding the G-NAF PID.
	33.	Do you agree with the proposal to add G-NAF PID to MSATS if the data were populated entirely by LNSPs?	Alinta Energy would prefer the option proposed in question 32
	34.	If AEMO were to add the G-NAF PID field (which would uniquely identify a physical address), do participants believe there is use in keeping the DPID field?	Alinta Energy would support not keeping the DPID field.
	35.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were also to be added?	Alinta Energy would support including the Section Number and DP number.
	36.	Would your organisation support adding Section Number and DP Number if G-NAF PID were not to be added?	Alinta Energy would support including the Section Number and DP number.
Feeder Class	37.	Do you agree with the proposal to make Feeder Class required for the jurisdiction of Queensland?	Alinta Energy supports addition of this field.
Transmission Node Identifier2	38.	Do you agree with the proposal to introduce TNI2?	Alinta Energy supports addition of this field.

2.3 NER Schedule 7.1

Information Category	Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
NER Schedule 7.1 Rule Change	39.	Do you see any benefit in Schedule 7.1 remaining as-is? If so, please detail the benefit.	Alinta Energy supports a review of Schedule 7.1 Alinta Energy believes that Schedule 7.1 should contain some high level information on what MSATS should contain.
	40.	Do you support AEMO's proposal? If you do not, please detail why.	Alinta Energy broadly supports AEMO's proposal and can see how minimising the requirements of S7.1 will allow for greater flexibility in the market.
Fields referenced in the NER that are not implemented in MSATS	41.	Do you see any benefit in adding the aforementioned fields to MSATS? If so, in which table would you propose they be added and how can the quality of data be ensured?	Alinta Energy does not see any value in adding other fields to MSATS, this information should be retained and maintained by the other accredited providers (MPB's and MDP's) and participants (MC's and LNSP's) so that they can carry out their obligations.

3. Proposed Changes in Standing Data for MSATS Guideline

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

Section No/Field Name	Participant Comments

4. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Heading	Participant Comments