

now, its concerns were mainly surrounding a potential increase in outages under PBR and how best to track outages and service levels appropriately.

- IPCAA indicated that a power outage for an industrial facility is very different than an outage in a residential home and the economic implications can be very high for the industrial customer.
- Some distributors stated that the existing reliability metrics are set at the system level and include all customer sites and segments. Under PBR revenue is key and therefore they would not want to upset the industrials who, for some utilities, make up a large portion of its load. The distributors also noted that they each have customer service representatives that are assigned to industrial customers and who are dedicated to work with those customers, stay in touch and communicate with them directly.
- The UCA expressed that it did not want to see a different perhaps higher level of service for different customers and if it did occur, the rates would need to be allocated accordingly. IPCAA indicated that it was not advocating for a different service level right now, it just wanted to track data appropriately.
- AUC staff stated that internally, they have been discussing the Rule 002 annual review meetings and whether they may provide an opportunity to address any outage monitoring data without creating a metric. Further, if parties could bring that information to the annual review meetings or circulate just before. IPCAA stated that it made sense to have something provisional and that having something on the table once a year would be useful. IPCAA did not want to get into the culture of bringing complaints to the Commission. IPCAA suggested that it would be willing to do a less formal survey of its member to see what their issues are and discuss them at the annual review meeting should an increase in complaints arise.
- AUC staff asked the utilities if there was information they are currently capturing that would help give assurance to IPCAA that service levels are the same? The utilities each then discussed its outage tracking and reporting systems, along with worst performing feeders and performance reports.
- IPCAA wanted more information on the data derived to find worst performing feeders as well as qualitative information such as root cause analysis and how it is tracked. IPCAA also suggested that receiving a graph detailing the SAIDI of each feeder on that company's system each year and then comparing the shape, not the numbers, over the years would tell a lot.
- The discussion resulted in two items that could potentially be reported in and brought to the annual review meeting.

ACTION: Each utility to submit by November 4, 2013, information about its internal major outage thresholds (on a feeder level) and reporting processes (mitigation, root cause analysis, etc).

ACTION: Each utility to check internally and report back by November 4, 2013, about the possibility of producing and providing (in the annual review meeting) a graph outlining the SAIDI of each of the feeders on its system.

3 Work completion metrics

- IPCAA stated its concern that the PBR cap will put some boundary pressure on capital spending and may result in the utilities delaying the building of capital projects. IPCAA does not want to see increasing delays because of capital caps and does not want to see an adversarial climate created. IPCAA would also like to see standardization regarding work completion reporting amongst the utilities, if possible.

- Discussion centered around how and what the different utilities track for their major projects. Each utility commented on its project management tools but mentioned that they didn't necessarily have a comprehensive database that could track the complete project from start to finish. Utilities conveyed that project delays could occur because of many factors and that comparing the companies on work completion would not be possible because of the variability amongst the companies, its projects and its service areas.
- The distributors further noted that they each have customer service representatives assigned to each large customer project who are in contact with the customer regularly to find out about any problems, concerns, etc. There was debate around which dates would be the most useful to track (requested in-service, actual in-service, when the request was made, after the first contribution was made) and what, if anything, could be measured.
- While the distributors were concerned with how any data submitted would be used or provide statistical significance, they agreed to check into the possibility of providing an "executive level" type analysis on new distribution connection work completion performance. The group agreed that any informal discussion about this possible data could take place at the annual review meetings and that it was not necessary to change Rule 002.

ACTION: Each utility to check internally and report back by November 4, 2013, about the possibility of providing an "executive level" type analysis on new distribution connection work completion performance at the annual review meetings. i.e. comment on the possibility of providing the timeframe between the first ("cheque") financial contribution from the customer and the actual in service date; reporting against in service dates; a customer satisfaction survey for new connection customers, etc.

4 Next steps

- AUC staff asked participants to email their responses to the action items discussed, to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca.
- AUC staff asked the group to consider and propose solutions if the possibilities discussed at the meeting would not work. AUC staff also encouraged the utilities to discuss amongst themselves a consistent framework that could work.
- AUC staff will circulate a draft meeting summary for review and comment.