METERING COMPETITION
EMBEDDED NETWORKS
METER REPLACEMENT PROCESSES

PROCEDURE CONSULTATION

SECOND STAGE PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant:

Completion Date:

Table of Contents

1. Metrology Procedure: Part A 3
2. Metrology Procedure: Part B 4
3. Service Level Procedures for MP 5

1. Metrology Procedure: Part A

Please delete any rows where there are no particpant comments

Clause	Heading	Participant Comments		
		Metering Competition	Embedded Networks	Meter Replacement Processes
12	DE-COMMISSIONING AND REMOVAL OF METERING EQUIPMENT AND NETWORK DEVICES	12(b) It is unclear how a 'use of system' agreement between the LNSP and the FRMP can govern the "installation and operation of …equipment", where the equipment is owned and operated by neither the LNSP or FRMP. While the purpose clearly indicates that Metrology does not cover reactive energy or controlled load, the example doesn't make sense, given metering installed under these rules will have to be contestable.		
12.1	Network Devices	As per 12. As per stage 1 response, the definition being "…performing a function other than supporting the application of a Network Tariff" is unclear. It appears that any metering that is used for market settlements will be considered a network device. This is clearly not the intention, nor in any way aligned with the NER. 12.1.3 It should be clear that an LNSP may not, except in emergency situations, break MPs seals or affect the metering installation. Once a seal is broken, the MP cannot provide assurance of the accuracy or safety of the installation.		

2. Metrology Procedure: Part B

Please delete any rows where there are no particpant comments

Clause	Heading	Participant Comments		
		Metering Competition	Embedded Networks	Meter Replacement Processes
9.1.	Validation of metering installations with remote acquisition of metering data		9.1(b) Not all NMIs will be allocated to LNSPs – they may be allocated to ENMs.	
10.2.	Validations to be performed for metering installations with check metering or partial check metering	10.2(e): should refer to section 7.2 for alarm list.		

3. Service Level Procedures for MP

Please delete any rows where there are no particpant comments

Clause	Heading	Participant Comments		
		Metering Competition	Embedded Networks	Meter Replacement Processes
3.4	Management of meter programming and authorised software	As raised in the initial feedback, it is unclear what the purpose of this is. In a recent forum, AEMO was unable to provide any insight into why this information will be of any value. Given that there is a cost to this, and no value associated, it does not meet the NEO. This section has been added, despite it not being part of the *Power of Choice* rule changes. Metropolis recommend that it is removed entirely.		
4.1	General commissioning requirements	4.1(c) This new requirement is not part of the *Power of Choice* rule changes, so it is not clear why it has been added. The make and model of metering equipment is on the nameplate, and every meter must be pattern approved. If the accuracy class is required, it is a simple matter to look it up. In addition, this information is available to appropriate parties via the MPs records. It is not clear who would require this information in the field, that would not already have access to it. For CT/VTs, the records have been poorly managed in the past, and there is no clear owner or party responsible for maintaining the information going forward, so there may be value in this. However, if the nameplate is readable, it's a relatively simple matter to look up the accuracy class for the make and model. Metropolis recommend removing this requirement.		

4.2	Metering Data Validation Requirements	4.2(a)(iii) has been incorrectly added. The referred to section, 13.5 of Metrology Procedure: Part A, is applicable only to to type 4a, 5, 6 & 7 meters. The capitalised term "Validated" is not defined.
4.3	Notifications following Metering Installation Commissioning	Why is this notification part of the SLP? This is clearly a B2B transaction, and would most appropriately fall under the IEC and B2B. 4.3(b) Table 1 Data and time: Typo, should be date not data. The date and time of *commissioning* does not appear to meet the needs of this notice. Commissioning may not occur at the same time as the meter install for a variety of reasons. In this case, the notice may be delayed by a significant amount of time. Propose changing it to the date of meter install, not commissioning. What is the purpose of the Suffix, NTC and Load Type? Historically the load type information has allowed the LNSP to maintain the network tariff code in MSATS. However, if MPs are maintaining NTCs in MSATS, why do the LNSPs need this information via this process – it will be available in MSATS in a similar timeframe. Control device: Presumably this is referring to existing network owned control devices, such as timeswitches and ripple controllers? Is there any desire to have information regarding control devices internal to the meter? I'm not sure what could be provided, beyond the fact that there is an internal controller. Channel: As previously noted, it's not clear what this is or how the channel setting can be determined by a MP. Test Results: The LNSP still has no right to the information, even in this reduced form. More importantly, if commissioning tests have failed there is a known problem and the installer will fix

		the problem. So the answer will always be “Pass”. As such, there is also no information provided in this field.