

AUC Rule 004: Tariff Billing Code Working Group Meeting Summary

Meeting date	March 5, 2014	Time	10 a.m. to 2 p.m.
Location	<u>Video conference AUC offices</u> Tenth Floor, 10055 - 106 Street Edmonton Fourth Floor, 425 First St. S.W. Calgary <u>Teleconference</u> Phone: 1-866-792-1318 Conference code: 8665992	Facilitator	AUC staff

1 Introductions

Name	Company
Linda Kinnee	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Steve Lai	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Bob Deyl	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Jacque Zabiran	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Jessica Laird	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Carol Benoit	ATCO Gas
Shannon Rittmeyer	ATCO Gas
Anne Glass	AUC
Maria Gray	AUC
Raymond Lee	AUC
Robert Thomas	AUC
Bettyann Skagen (via telephone)	Battle River REA
Ralph Steendam	CAREA/EQUS REA Ltd.
Lori Harnack (via telephone)	Cognera Corp.
Karen Cooke (via telephone)	Direct Energy
Trevor Martin (via telephone)	Direct Energy
Donna Sanderow	Encana Corporation
John Hutchison	ENMAX Commercial Services Inc.
Ray Poon	ENMAX Commercial Services Inc.
Carla Pitura	ENMAX Encompass
Leo Scarcelli	ENMAX Power Corporation
Sue Boyd	ENMAX Power Corporation
Hala Elsaadi	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Lisa Zuger	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Melissa Gibson	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Shirley Kwan	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Tina Dulguerov	FortisAlberta Inc.
Susan Enskat	UCA

2 Re-affirm a schedule for the rule change

- AUC staff opened the meeting by stating their objectives:
 1. To review all proposed changes to Rule 004 in the [stakeholder comment table](#) to ensure that the changes are relevant and stakeholders see value in adding them to the next version of the rule.
 2. To obtain agreement from the group not to move forward on any changes to Rule 004 until the cancel/rebill issues are agreed upon. This would mean only changing the rule once.
 - All stakeholders confirmed that they do not wish to proceed with any rule changes until all issues have been resolved, thus minimizing their system change costs.

3 Review of stakeholders' comments on the proposed changes

- The Rule 004 proposed changes and stakeholder comment table was reviewed in detail. Discussion ensued on each of the changes that stakeholders had submitted questions or concerns regarding.

Section 1.1 – Application

- There were no objections to the proposed changes.

Section 1.2 – Definitions

- There were no objections to the proposed changes.

Section 2.2.1 – Distributor-initiated communication

- The group agreed to the proposed changes. Issues with the paragraph numbering in this section, due to track changes, were brought up. AUC staff confirmed the numbering would be corrected in the final version.

Section 2.12 – Link tariff billing to distributor invoicing

- One of the parties mentioned that it would like wording added to specify that these files be sent to the retailer in a searchable form, such as a PDF in OCR format. It is useful for retailers to be able to search and copy or extract billing information from the distributor invoice. When the bill is received in a non-OCR format or faxed, it is not possible to extract information.
- All parties agreed that this was a good suggestion.

ACTION: All distributors to review their ability to provide the distributor invoice in a searchable format and respond to the AUC by April 3, 2014.

Table 2-1. Performance Requirements, Table Ref ID 1

- All parties present agreed to the change to Table 2-1, Table Ref ID 1.

Table 2-1. Performance Requirements, Table Ref ID 2

- A couple of the parties expressed concerns around the target set at a maximum of 6 business days. It was proposed to use the last calendar day of the month, following the billing period. All parties agreed to this suggestion.

ACTION: All parties to comment on the following revised wording by April 30, 2014.

Table 2-1., Table Ref ID 2

Measure: For transmission connected sites: Publication of transmission connected site charges in tariff bill file.

Responsibility: Electric distributor

Target: Last calendar day of the month following the charge period.

Table 2-1. Performance Requirements, Table Ref ID 9

- Discussion occurred around the proposed metric change from “Maximum: by next scheduled bill file publish date for the site” to “Maximum: 70 calendar days for 100 per cent of disputes”. Distributors felt that 100 per cent was an unachievable target.
- There was agreement to change the proposed metric to 99.5 per cent instead of 100 per cent.
- One retailer asked if this metric applied to all disputes or just TBDs. AUC staff confirmed that currently the metric only applies to TBDs. However, saw no reason why it could not include all disputes.

ACTION: AUC to draft wording around opening the metric to all disputes and changing the metric from 100 per cent to 99.5 per cent. AUC staff will open a RIM issue with the proposed wording for Table 2-1., Performance Requirements – Table Ref ID 9, Dispute resolution timing, by April 3, 2014, for parties to comment on and respond by April 30, 2014.

Table 2-2. Performance monitoring metrics, Table Ref ID 1

- A typographical error was brought to the AUC’s attention. The target should read 95 per cent, not 9 per cent.

ACTION: AUC to correct the target to read 95 per cent in Table 2-2., Table Ref ID 1.

Table 3-1. Tariff billing events, Table Ref ID 5

- Discussion ensued around this issue as one of the retailers present expressed a concern with the removal of the wording: “Retailer terminates a contract for provision of electric services”.
- After much discussion the retailer confirmed that it would not need to use the CSA if distributors are sending the TBF. Distributors were asked to confirm that they are transmitting a TBF once they get a drop and they are conforming to the timing in the rule. [However, the retailer confirmed, with AUC staff the next day, that distributors are sending the TBF and this is not an issue. No further action is required.]

Table 3-1. Tariff billing events, NEW

- A retailer stated that in addition to month end usage splits (mandatory), it would like a mandatory tariff bill period event at month end. Parties were not opposed to the idea but all agreed that further investigation was required to determine the magnitude of work to add the additional requirement.

ACTION: Distributors to investigate if a mandatory tariff bill period event at month end would involve significant additional cost. Parties to respond by April 30, 2014.

Section 4.3.1 – General tariff bill file rules – NEW

- Discussion was focused on transmission-connected sites and restricting enrolments to the first of the month. In the end it was agreed that the wording as proposed in Rule 004 was not an issue. The issue raised around first of the month enrolments belongs in Rule 021 and should be raised again at there. AUC staff stated it would raise the issue of the enrolment of transmission-connected sites at the next AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting.

ACTION: AUC to again take the transmission-connected sites enrolment issue back to the AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation group for discussion.

Section 4.3.9 – One-time charge – NEW

- The group discussed the proposed change to the one-time charge in the case of a energize request that is completed after a retailer switch. The proposed new rule requires the distributor to bill the prior retailer (the retailer who made the request).
- Discussion centered around what date to use. The date work was performed or the date of the request. It was pointed out that Section 2.12 already stipulates that “A tariff bill file is limited to one retailer and may only contain information for the periods when the recipient retailer is the retailer of record.” It was suggested that within those confines it would be up to the distributor what date to use and Section 4.3.9 need not mention dates at all. The group agreed.

Section B5.22 – One-Time Charge Code

- It was pointed out that with the splitting of prior period one-time charges into the appropriate billing periods, as proposed in the new Section 5.4.4, this change was no longer required.

Action: AUC to remove the item from the rule.

4 Standardizing of cancel/rebill

- AUC staff opened the discussion by stating that they do not have enough justification from retailers to standardize all aspects of the cancel/rebill process and encouraged retailers to provide financial justification should they want particular aspects of the process standardized.
- Retailers present at the meeting felt that the most important item to standardize was to ensure that the cancel and rebill occurred in the same file and that the one-time charges are broken down into the respective charge periods.

ACTION: AUC to develop wording by April 30, 2014, and will forward to stakeholders for discussion at the next Rule 004 working group meeting.

- There was discussion around data retention and debit/credit time periods. It was proposed not to standardize these items at this time.

ACTION: No change to an existing data retention period in the rule. Retailers to review and provide comments, if any, by April 3, 2014.

ACTION: No change to standardize debit/credit time periods at this time. However, retailers are invited to provide justification or cost benefit information that would justify this issue to be re-opened.

- When the group decided in 2011 that cancels must be transmitted at the same time as a rebill the group discussed the need for communication to retailers when a site could not bill on time because of the cancel/rebill. The group debated whether an email or new transaction would be better.
- When the TBC was first developed there was discussion at industry consultation meetings, whether the TSW transaction should be made a mandatory transaction. At that time only one party was using the TSW transaction, all others had manual work-arounds in place and while it was decided the transaction would continue to remain optional, parties felt that a TSW transaction was a better way to communicate when a site was not being billed than receiving the information in email form.
- Stakeholders expressed concern about the transaction as they were not sure of volumes. Also parties felt that they still had to follow up after the transaction was sent with an email to provide additional information and to resolve the issue.
- It was agreed that this change to the rule would be put on hold unless stakeholders can provide relevant statistics to support making the TSW transaction mandatory.

ACTION: Retailers to review and, if necessary, provide justification for making the TSW transaction mandatory.

5 Other issues

a) REA codes:

- Discussion occurred around REA codes and their use.
- The REA codes are used for REA charges that appear on the TBF, this code needs to be there so the retailer knows which REA a site belongs to. When the distributor sends the TBF they include the REA code so the retailers system picks up the code and knows which REA to present on the bill.
- The REA code list has not been updated since 2011.
- One retailer reminded the distributors that if an REA code is no longer in use it should remain in the table with an expiry date noted.
- It appears an EQUUS REA code has not been assigned yet. AUC will assign a REA code to EQUUS and update the REA codes.

ACTION: All distributors to review the REA codes and provide an update to the AUC by April 30, 2014. The AUC will post the information on its website. Distributors are to ensure that this practice continues on an ongoing basis.

6 Work plan and timelines

- There is the need for further discussions regarding the proposed changes to Rule 004.
- It is AUC staffs' goal to have the changes to Rule 004 effective January 1, 2015, with implementation occurring later in 2015. The group all agreed that the goal of reaching agreement by January 1, 2015, was achievable.
- AUC staff mentioned that the meeting summary will be distributed in two weeks and parties will be given at least two weeks to respond to action items. The next Rule 004 meeting will be planned for May 2014.