

AUC Rule 002 Industrial Customer Service Quality Metrics Meeting Summary

Meeting date June 23, 2014 **Time** 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.
Location AUC Calgary office **Facilitator** AUC staff
 Fourth floor, 425 First Street S.W.
 Calgary

1 Introductions

Name	Company
Larry Shaben	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Andrea Laroia	Alberta Utilities Commission
Maria Gray	Alberta Utilities Commission
Mathew Morgan	Alberta Utilities Commission
Robert Thomas	Alberta Utilities Commission
Chris Robertshaw	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Harry Haag	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Angela Corsi	FortisAlberta Inc.
Brian Murray	FortisAlberta Inc.
Deb Crossman	FortisAlberta Inc.
Rob Litzenberger	FortisAlberta Inc.
Jake Cheng	IPCAA
Rick Cowburn	IPCAA
Vittoria Bellissimo	IPCAA
Russ Bell	UCA

2 Follow-up discussion on work completion

- AUC staff began the meeting by stating that the intent of this discussion was not to make rule changes. The AUC is looking for utilities to provide an additional report to IPCAA on an annual or semi-annual basis for discussion at the annual review meetings.
- IPCAA reiterated their initial request of receiving reports on work completion statistics based around customer-agreed upon in-service dates, to allow for better visibility. Currently, IPCAA only sees the anomalies in the form of complaints, with no information IPCAA cannot determine what the average timelines are, or trends. IPCAA's objective is not rule changes. Standardization of approaches would be valuable but is not necessarily needed at this time.
- The objective of these high level reports is to foster more transparency in regards to work completion timeframes and, as an industry, to better understand and work through common issues that push back connection times. These reports will be used to ensure there is a reasonable level of comfort based on industry connection time trends so IPCAA can better help their members.

- One of the parties cautioned that all timelines are project specific and that when looking at averages, completion times can seem long. Including the approvals that need to be obtained, transmission upgrades or new construction can often take many years. IPCAA indicated that this is still useful information for consumers who need to plan their project timelines.
- FortisAlberta Inc. (Fortis) proposed to report on: the contract start date, the actual in-service date, a percentage of how many projects met the agreed-upon in-service date, a list of the main reasons why the in-service dates had to be changed, and explanations of outliers.
 - IPCAA was pleased with Fortis' proposed report content.
 - The UCA asked to see these reports before the annual review meetings.

ACTION: Fortis to submit a mock-up report to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by September 1, 2014.

ACTION: Fortis to provide, prior to the 2015 annual review meeting, a summary report on average work completion durations derived from the contract start dates, the estimated in-service dates, and the actual in-service dates; the percentage of projects that met the agreed-upon completion date; summary explanations of the outliers; and a summary of the main reasons why the in-service dates had to be changed over the course of the projects.

- ATCO Electric Ltd. (ATCO) proposed a report focusing on in-service dates; reporting the percentage of projects where ATCO was not able to be met the on agreed-upon in-service date. The main factors in missing agreed-upon in-service dates are due to customer changes in the scope of the project. ATCO stated that changes in in-service dates are very rarely driven by ATCO .
- ATCO is going to separate large distribution projects, which they determine based on cost, those greater than one million dollars are classified as large distribution projects.
- There was discussion around whether ATCO could provide the duration, like Fortis, as well as the percentage of projects that were completed by the in-service date. ATCO stated that they were not proposing to provide information regarding duration. However, they agreed to raise the question again internally. AUC staff stressed that project duration information would be useful to provide in this report.

ACTION: ATCO to check internally about the possibility of providing work completion information regarding the duration of missed in-service dates.

ACTION: ATCO to submit a sample report to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by August 1, 2014.

ACTION: ATCO to provide, prior to the 2015 annual review meeting, the total number and percentage of projects completed by the customer-agreed in-service date.

- IPCAA was interested in the main causes of changing the in-service dates and asked Fortis and ATCO to submit, in their reports, the main causes (note: it does not need to be 6). It was stated that the objective is not to report on utilities' performance, but to understand the causes. ATCO stated that they have committed to communicate to customers any issues that might affect the in-service date, and any changes to the in-service date. ATCO mentioned that it works with customers and look at all options.

Both ATCO and Fortis agreed that the reasons must be looked at on a case-by-case basis and while the information is not in an easily accessible format, the project managers track it manually.

- In a follow up email after the meeting, Fortis reiterated that their current application does not have an audit trail of changes regarding the customer negotiated date (estimated in-service date). The Operations Projects team will be implementing a change management process by the end of 2014 whereby change requests will be completed for changes in the customer negotiated in-service date. This will provide them with the information required to quantify the reasons for changes in the negotiated in-service date. However, this will only be available for projects completed in 2015 and onwards.
- AUC clarified that the detail being requested is not on a project specific basis, but as an overall percentage, under what reason.

3 Follow-up discussion on reliability

- IPCAA started the discussion reiterating their belief that the metrics SAIDI and SAIFI do not effectively capture the system's performance. These metrics do not differentiate between customer types and load levels. IPCAA acknowledged that reliability is generally good and is not a major issues among members at present; however, IPCAA would like to talk about developing a new metric that has less bias, against mid-sized customers, that they believe exists in SAIDI and SAIFI. Despite the fact that reliability has not had major issues, it remains a top priority for large industrial customers.
- IPCAA expressed their concerned that under PBR, the incentives in the industry will change and their members are concerned that the system will degrade.
- The group discussed this proposal; however, in the end, DFOs were unable to easily provide the data that would be required to develop a workable new metric that could be implemented. No further action was contemplated at this time.

4 Next steps

- AUC staff asked participants to email their responses to the action items discussed by July 21, 2014, to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca.