



Metering Task Force

1st Session Survey Results

- 38 companies represented by 17 respondents.
- Approximately 20,000 meters represented.

- Nearly everyone is familiar with M01 Section 5
- Over half of respondents are familiar with M01 R30 proposed changes to Section 5.
- One request to review the proposed text in some detail and discuss why it was rolled back.

- Concern about legacy equipment meeting current requirements.
 - Future projects that may install metering, but use existing CTs/PTs, do the new requirements still apply?
- More clarity requested around meter and metering equipment test and test frequency requirements.

- Everyone has meter maintenance and calibration practices in place.
- For revenue meters; 2 years is the most common maintenance interval for meters, with some 1, 3 and 5 year cycles mentioned.
- For non-revenue meters; answers were more diverse and some practices were much less stringent compared to revenue meters, for example “upon request, no set interval”, “testing during installation/replacement”, “as required”, etc.

- Revenue/Settlement metering; mostly 0.3, with many 0.2 class devices.
- New tie line metering; mostly 0.2 or 0.3 class, with all targets under 1% error.
- New non-tie line metering; wide spread, from 0.3% IT and 0.2% meter combination, to <6% (“protection grade”).

- All revenue metering comes in under 1.0% error.
- Some tie lines noted at 3% to 4% accurate, others less than 1%, perhaps reflecting primary/non-primary meters or revenue grade tie line meters/non-revenue grade tie line meters.
- Other active Transmission Owner meters, mostly a split between companies with nearly all meters less than 1%, or with nearly all meters 3% to 4%. A smaller number of companies and associated total meters were reported in the 4% to 5%, or the 5% and greater category.

- CCVT usage is prevalent across all Transmission Owner companies. Notably Generator Owners mostly reported no use or planned use.