

Competitive Metering --- Survey of States

State	Initial Guidance Provided through statute/Commission Order, etc.	Market Model	Timeframe for Development of Market Structure/Business Rules/Processes, etc.	Timeframe for Implementation after Commission Order approving Business Rules/Processes, etc.	Implementation Cost estimates	Comments
PA	<p>Commission Order at Docket No. L-00970128, which retains advanced metering as a regulated function of the EDC unless a Commission approved settlement incorporates provisions to the contrary.</p>	<p>"all or nothing" approach; EDC recognizes ESP & third party MSP; CM open to all "direct access" and SOS customers; MSP may sub-contract the MDMA, but both are combined as one entity (eliminates sub-unbundling of EDC metering credit); CM requires a remotely-read interval recording meter.</p>	<p>Market structure defined & approved by Commission prior to development of business rules; Business rules, processes & transactions under development since July '99, with tentative completion date 2nd half of 2001.</p>	<p>Dictated by EDC settlement. AP's implementation is 6 months after final Commission approval of business rules, processes & transactions.</p>	<p>Information not available</p>	<p>No licensed MSPs as of 1/1/01</p>
	<p>"Preferred Policy Decision" (D.95-2-063, as modified in 96-1-009) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). MBI unbundling was ordered in</p>	<p>sub-unbundling implemented; Meter Service Providers (MSPs) are the entities that install, validate, register, and maintain the physical meter on customer premises. Meter Data Management Agent (MDMA) is the entity that reads meters, validates the resulting data using validation, editing, and estimation</p>				

<p>Calif.</p>	<p>D.97-05-039. D.97-12-048, the Commission ordered the creation of the PSWG to review the interim metering standards adopted in that decision, and to recommend what permanent standards should be adopted by the Commission. 2. The PSWG workshop January 29, 1998. 3. Many different entities actively participated in the PSWG process. 4. The Workshop Report was filed on July 29, 1998. In December 1998, the CPUC issued D.98-12-080, which established permanent standards 5. It also gave the participants until Feb 1, 2000 to make all metering transactions EDI based</p>	<p>rules, adds corollary information needed to characterize the customer, and makes bill-ready information available to others for use in various applications. The billing agent (BA) prepares and submits bills to end-use customers, collects and processes payments, and remits aggregate funds and records to its client. Incremental credits developed for MSP and MDMA services</p>	<p>Roughly 1-1/2 years were spent discussing and developing the rules. PUC issued 97-05-039, May 6, 1997 providing order to unbundle with guidance on structure and functions. The working group put forth it's suggestions on July 29, 1998 in 197-05-039. The PUC issued approval order 98-12-080 on December 17, 1998.</p>		<p>\$37.6 million over the 1997-2001 period. \$17.6 Mil Metering, 19.5 Billing and \$1.0 Mil other systems</p>	<p>Pacific Economics group paper distributed to MD Metering Roundtable group discussed cost/benefits.</p>
<p>Illinois</p>	<p>Interim Ordered entered by Commission on 1/3/99 to initiate the proceeding and investigation of unbundling delivery services. On 4/12/99, the Commission issued an interim order which listed metering as an unbundled delivery service.</p>	<p>all or nothing approach; utility recognizes ESP & MSP; cm open to "delivery service" customers.</p>	<p>Third Interim Order issued on 12/22/99 discussed advanced meters only, metering processes to be unbundled, line of demarcation, customer eligibility, partial unbundled meter service, customers rights to perform own metering, MSP certification, and national standards. The final order was issued on 10/4/00 and addressed transition costs, metering tariffs, other costs and credits, and implementation effective date of 1/2/01.</p>	<p>The business rules were released in an order issued on 12/22/99. Unbundled metering was implemented on 1/2/01.</p>	<p>Rough estimates are in the range of \$16 million.</p>	<p>No licensed MSPs as of 1/1/01</p>

Arizona	Section 40-202 of the AZ Revised Statutes; AZ Corporation Commission Retail Electric Competition Rules R14-2-1601, et seq.	"All or nothing" approach; EDC recognizes ESP only; ESP may sub-contract metering & meter reading services to qualified third party (metering includes CTs/PTs up to 25 kV); meter ownership limited to EDC, ESP or customer; EDC metering credit unbundled into metering credit and meter reading credit, but both credits must be used simultaneously; interval recording meter required for customers greater than 20 kW.	Metering Committee formed in May '97 to identify, discuss and resolve metering & meter reading issues; recommendations were approved by the Commission in Dec '98; Retail Electric Competition Rules stayed in Jan '99 to allow more time to address & resolve issues.	After Jan '99 stay was lifted, CM was available to phased-in "direct access" customers in Oct '99 and all customers in Jan '01; some standardized processing rules developed from Oct '99 through Jun '00; additional rules, processes & transactions still under development.	Information not available.	Approximately 600 "direct access" customers eligible for CM; as of Nov '00: 7 entities certified as a provider of metering or metering services, and 9 entities certified as a reseller of metering or metering services.
New York	Order 97-13 Aug 1997. June 1999, Order to introduce CM	"all or nothing" approach, no sub-unbundling; customer may contract with ESCO, MSP, and MDSP; cm open to all customers w/peak demands of at least 50kW for 2 consecutive months; utility the POLR	NY Group given 18 months to develop rules	From Nov 1999 order to December 2000 to begin EDI testing.	Andersen Consulting commissioned to study. Full CM scenario incremental costs estimated of \$79 Mil, 20 yr NPV	Cases 00-E-0165 In the Matter of Competitive Metering and 94-E-0952 In the Matter of Competitive Opportunities Regarding Electric Service (Feb. 26, 2001)
New Jersey	NJ BPU Order under Docket No. EX99090676.	TBD	Parties to begin working groups in February 2001. Proceeding would begin in January 2002 if no working group progress.	Implementation to begin August 1, 2003.	TBD	
Delaware	Delaware House Bill 10. PSC Orders 5206 and 5454.	Contract specific basis.	After DE Transition Period.	After DE Transition Period.	TBD	

<p>NH</p>	<p><i>NH Electric Utility Restructuring Law (RSA 374-F). PUC issue Order No. 22,971- delay beyond 07/01/98 due to injunction issue. Under its settlement, PSNH would continue to provide all T & D services that it had provided to its customers including metering</i></p>				<p><i>The Department concludes that metering-related service should not be unbundled and provided through a competitive market because such competition: (1) would be extremely complex to implement in the near term and would divert energy more productively devoted to promoting advanced metering by electric distribution companies; (2) would not produce benefits (i.e., the efficient implementation of advanced metering equipment) that would otherwise be realized through the existing regulatory framework; (3) may not result in cost savings to customers; and (4) would result in significant disruptions in distribution company employee staffing levels. CM deferred, advance metering and access to data being offered through EDCs</i></p>
-----------	--	--	--	--	--

MA	<p>Section 312 of the Electric Restructuring Act, Chapter 164 of the Acts of 1997</p>				<p>The following is extracted from Report to the General Court Pursuant to Section 312 of the Electric Restructuring Act, Chapter 164 of the Acts of 1997. "While no specific dollar amounts to update the systems were provided to the Department, these commentaries suggested that the costs would be greater than the projected savings accrued as a result of the introduction of a competition for metering-related services"</p>	<p>Commission opened an investigation intended to result in the development of generic terms and conditions for the provision of advanced metering services by electric distribution companies. D.T.E. 01-28 (2001)</p>
VA	<p>Report to the Legislative Task Force of the Virginia General Assembly Recommendation and Draft Plan Retail Electric Billing and Metering Services from the Commonwealth of VA State Corp. Commission (December 12, 2000)</p>					<p>Deferred; Commission recommended that legislative action to restructure retail electric metering service should be deferred; Commission recommends continued investigation of the development of comp. metering markets in other states (12/12/00)</p>
New Mexico						<p>start of deregulation postponed until 2007</p>
NV	<p>NAC 704</p>					<p>customer choice and competitive metering deferred</p>

