

AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation Meeting Summary

Meeting date	September 23, 2015	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
Flora van Wageningen	AESO
Mike Choboter	AESO
Anne Glass	Alberta Utility Billing Inc.
Steve Glass	Alberta Utility Billing Inc.
Edwin Loo	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Enrique Nino	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Jacque Zabiran	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Mary Lou Pura	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Jessica Laird	ATCO Energy
Cathy Varga	ATCO Gas
Jennifer Bell	ATCO Gas
Andrea Laroija	AUC
Maria Baitoiu	AUC
Raymond Lee	AUC
Rose Ferrer	AUC
Lori Harnack	Cognera Corp.
Natasia Wasson	Cognera Corp.
Karen Cooke	Direct Energy
Ray Poon	ENMAX Commercial Services Inc.
Helen McKinlay	ENMAX Encompass
Paul Lindsay	ENMAX Power Corporation
Christine Harkness	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Jeff McNeill	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Jennifer Kerychuk	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Naomi Broni	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.

Name	Company
Andy Prout	EQUUS REA Ltd.
Ralph Steendam	EQUUS REA Ltd.
Brian Neufeld	FortisAlberta Inc.
Sally Legaspi	Just Energy
Lori Schultz	MIDAS Metering Services Ltd.
Sergio Guajardo	MIDAS Metering Services Ltd.
Morag Morel	UCA
Joanne Mulders	Utility Network & Partners Inc.

2 Review draft summary table of proposed changes to Rule 021 and Rule 028 (for 2016)

- As part of the regular rule review cycle, AUC staff prepared for discussion with the group, two tables which highlighted a number of proposed changes to Rule 021 and Rule 028. Most of the proposed revisions had been agreed to at various Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meetings held in 2014 and 2015.
- In order to address any outstanding stakeholder concerns and identify whether there was a need for additional changes, AUC staff discussed with the group the history and rationale behind each of the proposed changes.
- AUC staff indicated they will aim to have rule review completed by the end of November, 2015, with version 2.6 of Rule 021 and version 1.5 of Rule 028 effective January 1, 2016.

AUC Rule 021 – draft summary of proposed changes:

Section 2.13 Review of load settlement process

- AUC staff were tasked with reviewing Section 2.13 – Review of load settlement processes, contained in Rule 021 to determine if revisions needed to be made to this Section. After conducting an internal review of the diagnostic reporting requirements for LSAs and meeting with the AESO, AUC staff is recommending to remove the requirement for LSAs to conduct an annual review/audit of their load settlement processes. Instead a provision is proposed to be added requiring an LSA to conduct an interval review of its load settlement processes when a material change is made to its existing processes. The proposed revised language to Section 2.13 is as follows:

“Each LSA is required to conduct an internal review of its load settlement processes within 30 calendar days of making a material change to those processes. This internal review is required to assess the impact of the change(s) made and to verify the adequacy of such processes after such change(s). The LSA must document this assessment and findings, and retain such record. A copy of this record must be provided to the Commission and to the ISO upon request.

In its sole discretion, the Commission may order an audit to be conducted to verify the adequacy and accuracy of any LSA’s load settlement processes and calculations. The auditor’s costs and expenses are to be payable by the LSA. The LSA shall give the auditor access to any documents and provide such information as the auditor may request to conduct the audit.”

- The group contemplated whether 30 calendar days is enough time to arrange an internal audit. AESO staff expressed that if an LSA is aware that a material change to its load settlement processes is going to occur, conducting an internal review should be part of the LSA’s change plan. Therefore, having to conduct an internal review within 30 calendar days

should not be an issue. Based on group discussion, the LSAs agreed to keep the proposed language of 30 calendar days.

- One party asked for clarification regarding the scope of a “material change,” and whether the term “material” should be defined. Based on a number of discussions held internally, AUC staff felt that the term need not be too prescriptive. The group agreed.

Section 2.18 Transition of LSA/MDM/WSP, NEW ADDITION

- As noted by AUC staff, over the last few years, there have been instances where market participants performing the LSA/MDM/WSP functions have changed. In order to prevent customer impacts and disruptions from occurring in the event of a change in LSA/MDM/WSP, AUC staff is proposing to add a provision to Rule 021 which requires market participants proposing to make a change to the party performing the function of an LSA/MDM/WSP, to notify market participants at least 90 calendar days prior to the change being made. Additionally, in order to ensure that a smooth transition occurs, those participants are required to submit a transition plan to the AUC and to the ISO for approval. The addition of this section will ensure affected market participants have sufficient time to prepare for the changes and no customers are impacted.

“Section 2.18 Transition of LSA/MDM/WSP

Any market participant who proposes to cause a change to the party performing the role and responsibilities of an LSA/MDM/WSP must provide written notice to each market participant that may be affected by the change. The written notice is to be provided at least 90 calendar days prior to the date that the change is to take place. In addition to the written notice, both the current LSA/MDM/WSP and the new LSA/MDM/WSP designate must jointly submit a transition plan to both the AUC and to the ISO 60 calendar days prior to the effective date of the change. The transition plan must include the steps and processes to be carried out by the current and designated party to ensure that the transition of role and responsibilities will be done in a reasonable manner and will not disrupt the load settlement processes and other market participants’ business processes or disrupt service to customers. The transition plan must be approved by the AUC and the ISO prior to the change taking effect.”

- There was discussion around the number of days regarding notice and transition plan submission. AUC staff reiterated the intent is to make sure there is a plan in place delivered in a reasonable amount of time before the change is to happen. The group discussed what the timing should be regarding when the transition plan should be submitted to the AUC and to the ISO. As no consensus was reached, AUC staff advised that it would leave the proposed language as is, and provide stakeholders with the opportunity to comment when the table is circulated to the working group for informal consultation.
- In order to align Rule 021 with Rule 028, the group also agreed that similar language like the new Section 2.18 of Rule 021 be added to Rule 028. As such, AUC staff agreed to add the following Section to the draft proposed changes table for Rule 028: Section 2.12 Transition of LSA/MDM/Distributor.

ACTION: AUC staff to add the following new section to Rule 028: Section 2.12 Transition of LSA/MDM/Distributor.

Section 5.3.3(c) Materiality threshold and process

- The AESO had pointed out that LSA processes and timelines are not posted on the AUC website, as noted in Section 5.3.3(c), which states the following: “In order to ensure that the LSA has had sufficient time to process the RSA transaction set, parties other than the LSA should withhold submitting a PFAM application form after identifying an error until the LSA is

able to process the RSA transaction set as per the LSA's processes and timelines as identified on the AUC website.”

- AUC staff asked the group whether the requirement of including the processes and timelines of the LSA on the AUC website could be removed from the Rule, or if there was a need to begin posting this information on either the AUC's or the AESO's website. A number of parties questioned whether this provision was needed at all, as parties are not experiencing issues related to delays in processing PFAMs.
- Since the group did not have any immediate feedback to provide, AUC staff indicated that it would propose to remove Section 5.3.3(c) in the proposed change table. Stakeholders will be given the opportunity to comment on this proposed change when the table is circulated to the working group for informal consultation.

Section 9.6.1.4 Micro-generation cumulative meter consumption to retailers transaction (GCM) – process rules and content [not in the proposed change table circulated before the meeting]

- AESO staff proposed the following change to the GCM transaction: “*Micro-generation cumulative meter ~~consumption~~ reading to retailers transaction (GCM) – process rules and content.*”
- The group acknowledged that the GCM is referring to a meter reading, and not to the meter consumption.
- The group agreed to this change.

ACTION: AUC staff to add the following change to the draft proposed changes table in all instances in Rule 021 referring to Micro-generation cumulative meter ~~consumption~~ reading to retailers transaction (GCM).

Section 9.6.2.4.1, Table 13. Daily system measurement transaction (DSM) [not in the proposed change table circulated before the meeting]

- The group identified that Table 13, Sequence 7 description should be changed from “signed values only” to “positive values only,” as this sequence can only be populated with positive values. In addition, Sequence 9 allows for negative values, therefore the group agreed to change the wording for the description from “signed values only” to “negative values allowed”.
- AUC staff agreed to include these changes in the draft proposed changes table for Rule 021: Section 9.6.2.4.1, Table 13.

ACTION: AUC staff to add the following changes to the draft proposed change table for Rule 021, Table 13: Change Sequence 7 description “signed values only” to “positive values only” and Sequence 9 description “signed values only” to “negative values allowed”.

Section 9.4.6.14, Table 5. Site ID catalogue transaction (SID)

- As previously agreed in the AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting held on February 18, 2015, AUC staff reminded the group of the following changes to Table 5. Site ID catalogue transaction: the data type/size of Sequence 30 (Area Name field) is proposed to change from Varchar(20) to Varchar(30), and the data type/size of Sequence 31 (Cluster Correlation Key field) from Number(6) to Number(13).
- The group had no comments and agreed to the proposed change.

Section 9.6.3.1(4) Select retailer request transaction (SRR) – process rules and content

- As previously agreed in the June 17, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting, AESO staff had proposed that Section 9.6.3.1“(4) The WSP shall track by retailer the number of UCIs rejected as per Section 9.6.3.1(3) above and report monthly to the ISO.” be removed because the AESO’s system is already built to handle UCIs and it is already made aware of the number of UCIs that are not being formatted correctly. Therefore AESO staff did not see the benefit of having parties create a manual report for separate UCI rejections as currently required.
- The group had no comments and agreed to the removal of this subsection.

Section 9.6.5.2, Table 25. Update site address transaction (USA)

- As previously agreed in the AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting held on February 18, 2015, AUC staff reminded the group of the following proposed changes to Table 25. Update site address transaction: the data/type size of Sequence 28 (Area Name field) from Varchar(20) to Varchar(30), and the data/type size of Sequence 29 (Cluster Correlation Key field) from Number(6) to Number(13).
- The group had no comments and agreed to these changes.

Section 9.6.4.1, Table 22. Update customer information transaction (UCI), Sequence 52 and 53

- There seemed to be confusion regarding how discussions on the critical-to-have-power (“CTHP”) flag for customers surfaced. AUC staff reminded the group of the following two issues: (1) There were some competitive retailers who were selling CTHP to all of their customers as a feature on their contracts, therefore there was a need to discourage this practice; and (2) To look out for vulnerable customers in the case of a disconnection for COMP. Issue (1) resulted in the requirement for the retailer to have appropriate supporting medical documentation on record which was changed in Version 2.4 Sequence 52 of Rule 021 – Table 22, and issue (2) resulted in a proposed wording clarification to Sequence 52 of Rule 021 – Table 22, where a “Y” would be used for those customers that are CTHP due to human medical needs. While there is no guarantee that supply of power will be available at all times (e.g. in an emergency situation or unforeseen event), AUC staff reiterated to the group that the onus is on retailers to track customers that are CTHP for human medical needs and provide this information to distributors. Similarly, distributors are expected to keep track of CTHP sites. The group expressed that hopefully those customers who are CTHP, have a backup generation source available to them, as there is no guarantee that a disruption in power will not occur.
- AUC staff asked retailers to confirm whether a doctor is required to sign the medical form required under Sequence 52 of Rule 021 – Table 22. Parties confirmed that yes a doctor’s signature is required. For information purposes, AUC staff requested retailers to send a copy of the medical form and the letter that goes along with it to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca. Retailers agreed.

ACTION: Retailers to send a copy of the medical form and the letter (as required under Sequence 52 of Rule 021 – Table 22) to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca.

- As suggested by the AUC’s legal team, AUC staff noted that when retailers are sending a disconnection notice, retailers should provide some wording in the notice that if a customer should not be disconnected due to human medical needs, the customer should contact the retailer as soon as possible. AUC staff advised that retailers have a responsibility to ensure that enough notice is provided to the customer before disconnecting.

- Further discussion led to when a vulnerable customer is in arrears; in such cases, the customer may not be opening their mail or willingly answering phone calls from its retailer, therefore the group questioned whether a similar warning message should be included on the door knockers (warning notice) from distributors.
- There was discussion about distributor practices on de-energizing a site that has the flag marked as “Y”. A few parties seemed to be confused about distributor practices relating to de-energization when a site is marked as “Y”. It was clarified that the Rule states (in Sequence 52) that in order for the distributor to de-energize the site, this field must have a value of “N” or “[null]”.
- There was discussion about the “Y” flag and whether it was acceptable for retailers to send the flag to distributors in the case of a non-residential or farm customer, with human medical needs (e.g. a hospice or hospital).
- Discussion ensued, and although there is an expectation that the distributor would already have a site noted as CTHP in its system, it would be at the retailer’s discretion to be able to mark the field as a “Y”, like in the case of a hospice. It was discussed that “customer” could include either a residential or farm customer, therefore there is no need to be so prescriptive. As such, it was agreed that the proposed addition of “residential or farm customer” to Sequence 52 was no longer needed, but that “human” medical needs should still be added to the CTHP flag. After the meeting, AUC staff researched the definition of a “customer” in Rule 021 and found that it is defined as “a person purchasing electricity for the person’s own use,” (as defined in the *Electric Utility Act*), therefore reinforcing the agreement of not adding the wording “residential or farm” customers.
- Action item from February 18, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting: “AUC staff to discuss with Direct Energy offline how it would like Direct Energy to proceed with how to handle critical-to-have-power customers and sites now that its system change has occurred.”
 - AUC staff advised that since ATCO Electric is expecting to be able to make a change in its system allowing it to differentiate between CTHP customers and sites by Q1 of 2016, DERS should hold off on its cleanup until this change has been made.

Section 9.6.7 Energize/de-energize site

- In reference to the October 1, 2014, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting, it was agreed that Section 9.6.7(3)(a) be revised as follows: “(a) An exception to the performance standard stated in Section 9.6.7(3) above shall be permitted for scheduled maintenance or for other reasons that are specifically approved by the AUC, not to exceed ~~two~~ five non-consecutive calendar days per calendar month.”
- This change is to allow for ATCO Electric’s regularly scheduled system backups which take place on Saturday evenings between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. (and at which time, ATCO Electric is unable to meet the hourly requirement).
- The group had no comments and agreed to this change.

Section 9.7 Transaction sets with standard content

- AESO staff proposed the following change to Section 9.7: “The following transaction sets does not require electronic transmittal ~~or standard format.~~”
- AESO staff explained that if participants do opt to use the transaction, standard defined formatting is used to make receiving and reading the transaction easier for all receiving parties. In the meeting, it was pointed out that it is not a transaction set; therefore it was proposed that the word “set” also be removed.

- The group agreed to this change.

ACTION: AUC staff to incorporate in the Rule 021 (Section 9.7) and Rule 028 (Section 8.7) proposed changes table the following changes: The following transaction sets does not require electronic transmittal or standard format.

Appendix A, Table A-4 Wire services provider (WSP) ID

- Table A-4, Wire services provider (WSP) ID, has been updated to reflect that EQUUS REA has been assigned REA code 0130.
- Rather than replacing “Central REA” with “EQUUS REA”, the group suggested that an expiry date be added for Central REA, and that a new row be added for EQUUS REA with the same REA code in order to accurately reflect when EQUUS REA became active. AUC staff agreed to update Table A-4 accordingly.

ACTION: AUC staff to update Table A-4 as follows: Include an expiry date for Central REA, add a new row for EQUUS REA with the same REA code and add an active date for EQUUS REA.

- In addition, the group suggested that the Expiry column be updated to include only valid expiry dates, and that all instances of “Jan 01, 2099” be deleted from the table. AUC staff agreed to update the table accordingly.

ACTION: AUC staff to update Table A-4 to include only valid expiry dates and to delete all instances of “Jan 01, 2099” from the table.

- ATCO Electric staff informed the group that Manning REA is no longer a WSP. ATCO Electric staff agreed to follow-up and provide the expiry date to the AUC so that Table A-4 could be updated. EQUUS advised that it would also review the table and inform the AUC of any additional changes so that Table A-4 can be updated. Both parties agreed to email regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca with this information.

ACTION: ATCO Electric staff to email regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca the expiry date for Manning REA.

ACTION: EQUUS REA to review Table A-4 and inform regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca of any additional changes so that Table A-4 can be updated.

Appendix A, Table A-6 Meter data manager (MDM) ID

- Table A-6, Meter data manager (MDM) ID, has been updated to reflect that EQUUS REA has been assigned Central REAs MDM ID 2130.
- Similar to Table A-4, rather than replacing “Central REA” with “EQUUS REA”, the group suggested that an expiry date be added for Central REA, and that a new row be added for EQUUS REA with the same MDM ID in order to accurately reflect when EQUUS REA became active. AUC staff agreed to update Table A-6 accordingly.

ACTION: AUC staff to update Table A-6 as follows: Include an expiry date for Central REA, add a new row for EQUUS REA with the same MDM ID and add an active date for EQUUS REA.

- Similar to Table A-4, ATCO Electric staff advised that Manning REA is no longer an MDM, and agreed to follow-up and provide the expiry date to the AUC so that Table A-6 could be

updated. EQUS advised that it would also perform a check and inform the AUC of any additional changes in MDMs so that Table A-6 can be updated. Both parties agreed to email regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca with this information.

ACTION: ATCO Electric staff to email regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca the expiry date for Manning REA.

ACTION: EQUS REA to review Table A-6 and inform regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca of any additional changes so that Table A-6 can be updated.

Appendix A, Table A-17 Loss class reference table

- Action item from the June 17, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting: “EDTI staff to follow-up internally on whether it can update its loss class codes to be less customer specific and if it can provide loss class descriptions similar to those descriptions used by other parties in Table A-17 of Rule 021. AUC staff to work offline with EDTI on this issue, and an update will be provided at the next scheduled meeting.”
- AUC staff reminded the group that all loss classes listed within Table A-17 are the same identifiers that are used in the WSD, with the exception of EDTI. At the last Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting, there was some contemplation on whether Table A-17 should be kept in Rule 021, and it was decided that since a number of parties found this table to be useful in situations such as applying UFE or setting up a new retailer, Table A-17 should remain as part of the Rule.
- AUC staff asked EDTI for an update on whether it can update its loss class codes to be less customer specific and if it can provide loss class descriptions similar to those descriptions used by other parties in Table A-17 of Rule 021.
 - EDTI confirmed that it is able to update its loss class codes to be less customer specific, which would result in a minor system change on its end. EDTI will review each of the loss classes under its zone and provide changes to the AUC when the draft proposed change table is sent out to the working group for review and comment. AUC staff will then include these changes in the draft proposed changes table for Rule 021 that will go out for formal comment.
 - Because EDTI will need to make a minor change to its system to make updates to its loss classes in Table A-17, AUC staff asked when EDTI’s system would be ready with these changes. EDTI noted that it would follow-up internally and let the AUC know. In follow-up to the meeting, EDTI has since advised that changes to its loss class codes would be implemented in February 2016.

AUC Rule 028 – draft summary of proposed changes:

Section 2.12 Transition of LSA/MDM/WSP, NEW ADDITION

- The history and rationale for this proposed change can be found on page 3 of this meeting summary, under “Section 2.18. Transition of LSA/MDM/WSP, NEW ADDITION”.
- As discussed under new “Section 2.18 Transition of LSA/MDM/WSP,” in order to align Rule 021 with Rule 028, it was agreed that the following new language also be added to Rule 028:

“Section 2.12 Transition of LSA/MDM/distributor

Any market participant who proposes to cause a change to the party performing the role and responsibilities of an LSA/MDM/distributor must provide written notice to each market participant that may be affected by the change. The written notice is to be provided at least 90 calendar days prior to the date that the change is to take place. In

addition to the written notice, both the current LSA/MDM/distributor and the new LSA/MDM/distributor designate must jointly submit a transition plan to both the AUC and to the ISO 60 calendar days prior to the effective date of the change. The transition plan must include the steps and processes to be carried out by the current and designated party to ensure that the transition of role and responsibilities will be done in a reasonable manner and will not disrupt the load settlement processes and other market participants' business processes or disrupt service to customers. The transition plan must be approved by the AUC and the ISO prior to the change taking effect."

ACTION: AUC staff to add the following new section to Rule 028: Section 2.12 Transition of LSA/MDM/Distributor.

Section 8.4.6.12, Table 2. Site ID catalogue transaction (SID)

- As previously agreed in the AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting held on February 18, 2015, AUC staff reminded the group of the following changes to Table 2. Site ID catalogue transaction: the data type/size of Sequence 30 (Area Name field) is proposed to change from Varchar(20) to Varchar(30), and the data type/size of Sequence 31 (Cluster Correlation Key field) from Number(6) to Number(13).
- The group had no comments and agreed to these changes.

Section 8.6.5.2, Table 14. Update site address transaction (USA)

- As previously agreed in the AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting held on February 18, 2015, AUC staff reminded the group of the following changes to Table 14. Update site address transaction: the data/type size of Sequence 28 (Area Name field) was changed from Varchar(20) to Varchar(30), and the data/type size of Sequence 29 (Cluster Correlation Key field) from Number(6) to Number(13).
- The group had no comments and agreed to these proposed changes.

3 Former RIM issue 530, Rules 021 and 028, Erroneous enrolment process

- Action item from the June 17, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting: "Parties to report back at the next meeting on how the new process of distributors emailing both retailers and copying the UCA is working in the case of an erroneous enrolment."
- ATCO Gas staff advised that since the last meeting, they have now been emailing both retailers for cases of erroneous enrolments, and copying the UCA in cases where the UCA initiated the concern. ATCO Gas has encountered 49 erroneous enrolments since June, none of which were escalated by the UCA.
- A number of other parties expressed that the email process has been working very well.
- One party questioned whether the AUC is proposing to add any new language to Rule 021 and Rule 028 regarding erroneous enrolment. AUC staff indicated that it would not be proposing any changes to the language in Rule 021 and Rule 028, and that the email process should continue.
- Although the process was working well, one party noted that it would be helpful to get an update from the UCA regarding the number of escalated erroneous enrolments and whether this new email process has helped alleviate the number of cases the UCA receives. UCA staff advised that, although they could not comment on the exact number, they believe that there are still a high number of these cases that are occurring.

- AUC staff suggested that the action item remain the same, and include an update from the UCA on the number of these cases for next meeting. No changes to the erroneous enrolment process will be made to Rule 021 or Rule 028 at this time. The group agreed.

ACTION: Parties to report back at the next meeting on how the new process of distributors emailing both retailers and copying the UCA is working in the case of an erroneous enrolment. Update from the UCA on the number of escalated erroneous enrolment cases it is receiving.

4 Discussion 03, Rule 021, Section 9.4.2(3) File naming convention

- AESO staff expressed that there is currently no consistency between how parties use the file naming convention for the response file for transactions with the Transaction Code field populated, even though Rule 021 states it should look as follows:
TRX_From_To_YYYYMMDDHHMISSR.CSV or
TRX_From_To_YYYYMMDDHHMISSR.csv
- AESO staff explained that the “From” and the “To” will change depending on the sender, but the original date and time that the file was created should remain the same, and an R should be added at the end as per the rule. AUC staff reminded the group that Section 9.4.2(1) of the Rule defines “From” as the ID of the sender and “To” as the ID of the receiver. The group speculated that there could be confusion with the language contained in Section 9.4.2(3) regarding the response file (a mirrored back transaction file).
- AUC staff committed to working offline with the AESO to provide clarification on the term “mirrored-back” transaction file under Section 9.4.2(3). This proposed change will be included in the proposed changes table, and stakeholders will have an opportunity to comment on this change when it is sent out to the working group for review.

ACTION: AUC staff to work offline with the AESO to provide clarification on the term “mirrored-back” transaction file under Section 9.4.2(3). AUC staff to incorporate this language in the Rule 021 (Section 9.4.2(3)) and Rule 028 (Section 8.4.2(3)) proposed changes table.

5 Discussion 04, Rule 028, Delayed SROs

- Action item from the June 17, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting: “ENMAX Encompass and Direct Energy to continue monitoring cases of delayed SROs. Updates will be discussed at the next scheduled Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting.”
- ENMAX Encompass staff advised that since the last meeting, it has not received any escalations due to this issue and is not experiencing the same volume of delayed SROs.
- AUC staff asked the group to confirm that this discussion community could now be closed. The group agreed.

ACTION: AUC staff to close Discussion 04, Rule 028, Delayed SROs.

6 Discussion 05, Rule 021, UCI outage notification phone number

- Action item from the June 17, 2015, AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting: “Retailers to validate whether Sequence 59 of Table 22 in Rule 21 is currently being populated with the site contacts preferred number. Retailers to provide this information under “Discussion 05, Rule 021, UCI outage notification phone number” by September 2, 2015.”

- ATCO Electric staff expressed that not all retailers had indicated in their comments to Discussion 05, what phone number they are using to populate Sequence 59 (Site Contact Phone Number) of Table 22 in Rule 021. It advised the group that it is looking for some consistency amongst retailers on how they populate this sequence, and asked retailers whether they are populating Sequence 59 with the customer's home phone number.
 - The majority of retailers expressed that Sequence 59 is not always populated with the home phone number, but often times, it is populated using the preferred number that has been provided by the customer (home, mobile, work etc.).
 - The group contemplated whether the field names of Sequence 59, 60, 61, 62 and 63 could be re-named to Phone Number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 respectively (with Phone Number 1 being the preferred phone number and Phone Number 5 being the least preferred phone number). Although this would help provide consistency amongst retailers regarding how they populate each Phone Number field, ATCO Electric staff advised that it requires a specific field for cell phone numbers, therefore the suggested change would not work.
 - Another reason ATCO Electric raised this discussion is because it is seeing Sequence 59 being populated with invalid phone numbers (i.e. 111-111-1111). This makes it difficult to contact the customer when there is an outage as ATCO Electric's system is automated to call Sequence 59 first, although other sequences may have a valid number. It was suggested that retailers verify their data to make sure the phone numbers are valid in the UCI. If the customer representative does not know the number, they should not populate the field with an invalid number.
 - One retailer mentioned that they do not do checks on the accuracy of the number, only its format. Also, for instances where this happens, it was suggested that ATCO Electric should send back the UCI and ask for updated customer information. ATCO Electric mentioned that in some cases they will receive the same UCI back with the error not corrected.
 - The group agreed to close this discussion, on the basis that retailers going forward will make sure phone number sequences get populated with a valid phone number and will update and correct the existing UCIs for any invalid phone numbers.

ACTION: The AUC to close the Discussion 05, Rule 021, UCI outage notification phone number

7 Discussion 07, Rule 021, Revoke De-Energize (RDR) Transaction

- ENMAX Power Corporation raised the following discussion regarding the Revoke De-Energize (RDR) Transaction in Rule 021. EPC staff questioned how a distributor should respond back to the retailer if an RDR file were to fail content or format validations. Currently, the RDR transaction does not have a transaction status code element sequence or corresponding notification transaction to inform the retailer why an RDR transaction has failed.
- EPC staff questioned whether it would be worthwhile to add a response transaction to Rule 021, where a mirrored back file appended with an R is delivered by the distributor to the retailer. Currently, no response transaction is sent from the distributor to the retailer in the case of a failed file, therefore the retailer is left to wait for either a DEC or DEF for the site.
- AUC staff asked the group to comment on the frequency of RDR transactions. A number of parties advised that the frequency of RDR related issues are very rare, and the frequency is relatively low.

- Retailers did not have concerns with receiving a response through the DEC and DEF transaction, and advised that the addition of a response transaction to Rule 021 was not required at this time.
- AUC staff asked the group to confirm that this discussion could now be closed. The group agreed.

ACTION: AUC staff to close Discussion 07, Rule 021, Revoke De-Energize (RDR) Transaction.

8 Discussion 08, Rule 021, Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes

- ENMAX Power Corporation raised the following discussion regarding Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes. EPC staff noted that there is no transaction status code for an invalid LSA ID. Since the SRR has an LSA ID element sequence (Sequence 6) there is a possibility that a data entry error code could be made in this field which would result in a failed enrollment. As such, EPC staff is requesting that status code 0009 – Invalid LSA ID be added to Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes.
- The group had no objections, and AUC staff agreed to add status code 009 – Invalid LSA ID to Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes.

ACTION: AUC staff to add status code 009 – Invalid LSA ID to Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes.

- AUC staff asked the group to confirm that this discussion could now be closed. The group agreed.

ACTION: AUC staff to close Discussion 08, Rule 021, Table A-9 – Enrolment/de-enrolment transaction status codes.

9 Discussion 09, Rule 021, Table A-9 – UCI transaction status codes – general information

- ENMAX Power Corporation raised the following discussion regarding Table A-9 – UCI transaction status codes – general information, noting that there is no transaction status code for an invalid number of fields in the transaction. For cases when it receives a UCI which has an invalid number of fields, it opts to use status code 0027 (other – call distributor for details). As a result, EPC staff is requesting that status code 0024 – Invalid number of fields in the transaction be added to Table A-9 – UCI transaction status codes – general information.
- Based on the group discussion, status code 0024 was deemed a universal transaction. Therefore, the group proposed that status code 0024 – Invalid number of fields in the transaction be moved from instances where the sender is the WSP, LSA, MDM throughout Table A-9 under the table pertaining to Universal transaction status codes. AUC staff agreed to update the AUC Rule 021 draft proposed changes table accordingly.

ACTION: AUC staff to move status code 0024 – invalid number of fields in the transaction be moved from instances where the sender is the WSP, LSA, MDM throughout Table A-9 under the table pertaining to Universal transaction status codes.

- AUC staff asked the group to confirm that this discussion could now be closed. The group agreed.

ACTION: AUC staff to close Discussion 09, Rule 021, Table A-9 – UCI transaction status codes – general information.

10 EQUUS to discuss question about SRR transaction – Rule 021

- As per Rule 021, the Select Retailer Request (SRR) is sent to the LSA only. EQUUS raised a question regarding the SRR transaction, noting that in Alberta there are some cases where the LSA is not the same as the WSP. In these instances, EQUUS as the WSP does not get the SRR but does get the UCI. EQUUS then waits for the SRW from the LSA but there is a time lag and then EQUUS has to match the UCI to the SRW. In addition, EQUUS as the WSP cannot send the response transactions and its concern is that the retailer agreements are with the WSP and not with the LSA. Therefore, EQUUS believes that the SRR should be received by the WSP (or at least copied on it) and the corresponding response transactions should also be sent by the WSP. If the WSP could receive the SRR and send the corresponding files, it could then send the required transactions to the LSA to update the information in the load settlement engine.
- FortisAlberta mentioned it has put into place, practices to deal with the SRR in cases where it is the LSA but not the WSP; in these cases, FortisAlberta will forward the required information to EQUUS via the SRW. This though does not solve the timing issues for EQUUS.
- Parties discussed the possibility of retailers sending the SRR directly to the WSP. However, that would result in significant system changes for all retailers; therefore the LSA should continue to receive the SRR. FortisAlberta will continue to work with EQUUS. FortisAlberta, EQUUS and the AESO agreed to work together on these issues. The group agreed to close this discussion.

Action: AUC staff to close Discussion 06, Rule 021, SRR transaction question.

11 AUC follow-up on Discussion Communities

- As requested by the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group, AUC staff revised the layout of the Rule 021 and Rule 028 Discussion Community as follows: the existing categories (01 Electric, 02 Gas, and 03 Electric and Gas) were consolidated into one category titled “Electric and Gas”, and a “Closed” category was also added.
- AUC staff also indicated that based on internal discussions with its IT department; there were limited solutions to resolving the inaccurate number of discussions and replies that were displaying within Discussion Communities at the category level. To avoid confusion, AUC staff informed the group that this display has been removed from the category level.
- AUC staff also informed the group that because Discussion Communities is an “out-of-the-box” forum that is part of SharePoint, there are limitations on how to filter discussions. AUC staff inquired internally regarding the ability to filter alphabetically or numerically, however the sorting function only allows for discussions to be filtered based on the following criteria: Recent, What’s hot, My discussions, Unanswered questions, Answered questions and Featured.
- One party asked whether it would be possible to make the font size bigger when printing a discussion off of the AUC’s eFiling system. AUC staff will work internally with its IT department to see if the font size can be changed within the print settings.

ACTION: AUC staff to work internally with its IT department to see if the print settings within Discussion Communities can be altered to allow for the font size to be bigger.

- Another party had noticed that some stakeholders were not including their name and company when commenting on a discussion, and that the naming convention specified by the AUC was not being followed all the time. AUC staff noted that they will often have to edit a discussion or comment to ensure the proper naming convention is used. AUC staff reminded parties to please use the recommended naming convention (Discussion Number, AUC Rule, Discussion Title). In the meantime, if parties are unsure of whom the stakeholder is and what company they are from, they can simply click on the username within Discussion Communities to display the user's email address. One party asked if the user guide could be re-circulated to the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group. Based on recent changes to the layout, AUC staff advised that it would update the user guide before re-circulating a copy to the working group.

ACTION: AUC staff to update and re-circulate the Discussion Communities user guide to the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group.

12 Other issues

- Cognera informed the group that there has been some activity from retailers regarding a potential PFAM process for gas. Cognera advised that it will be holding a teleconference on October 8, 2015, to discuss three recommendations that have been put forward by retailers. At this meeting, it intends that retailers will reach a consensus on a single recommendation. Assuming an agreement is reached, Cognera will contact the AUC about reconvening the PFAM process for gas working group. Those who are interested in attending the teleconference should email Lori Harnack at lharnack@coagnera.com with "Industry Meeting: Gas PFAM" as the subject line.

ACTION: Those retailers who are interested in attending the PFAM process for gas teleconference to email Lori Harnack at lharnack@coagnera.com with "Industry Meeting: Gas PFAM" as the subject line.