

AUC Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation Meeting Summary

Meeting date May 16, 2017 **Time** 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

Location Video conference AUC offices **Facilitator** AUC staff
 Tenth Floor, 10055 – 106 Street
 Edmonton
 Fourth Floor, 425 First St. S.W.
 Calgary
Teleconference
 Phone: 1-866-792-1318
 Conference code: 8665992

1 Introductions

Name	Company
Mike Choboter	AESO
Anne Glass	Alberta Utility Billing Inc.
Heather Hart	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Cheryl Payne	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Daryl Pattison	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Enrique Nino	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Theressa Martin	ATCO Electric Ltd.
Jessica Laird	ATCO Energy
Robert Yeatheard	ATCO Gas
Cathy Varga	ATCO Gas
Andrea Laroiya	AUC
Fino Tiberi	AUC
Maria Baitoiu	AUC
Raymond Lee	AUC
Rose Ferrer	AUC
Summer Abney	AUC
Trevor Martin	Direct Energy
Paul Seely	Direct Energy
Karen Cooke	Direct Energy
Leslie Strickland	ENMAX Customer Care
John Hutchinson	ENMAX Commercial Services
Paul Tung	ENMAX Power Corporation

Name	Company
Sandra McCowan	ENMAX Power Corporation
Helen McKinlay	ENMAX Power Corporation
Hala El Saadi	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Danielle Blackwell	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Naomi Broni	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Ralph Steendam	EQUUS REA Ltd.
Brian Neufeld	FortisAlberta Inc.
Dan Devereaux	FortisAlberta Inc.
Joanne Mulders	Utility Network & Partners Inc.

2 AUC surveys

- AUC staff advised that they would be introducing a new practice where stakeholders would be surveyed regarding the AUC’s consultation process. A survey would be sent out to attendees after each meeting requesting their feedback on their experience of the consultation (e.g., was the consultation productive, were meaningful discussions held, etc.). The purpose of these surveys is to allow AUC staff to identify areas in which they can improve the consultation process for stakeholders.

3 Abandoned oil wells – update on status of working group

- During the last Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting held on February 28, 2017, it was agreed that a working group be established to discuss the issues regarding abandoned oil and gas wells.
- AUC staff advised that because Proceeding 22091 (dealing with changes to the terms and conditions of service of distribution utilities with oil and gas rates) was still active before the Commission, the establishment and any work done through the working group would be put on hold. Proceeding 22091 has since increased in scope, therefore AUC staff advised that it would wait until they had received direction from the panel regarding what would be covered as part of the proceeding versus the working group.
- One stakeholder asked whether parties should continue with the interim processes which were established to deal with abandoned oil and gas sites, to which AUC staff confirmed yes.

4 Micro-Generation working group – update from AESO staff

- During the last Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting, it was agreed that a micro-generation working group be established to discuss how cases of aggregated sites would be handled (e.g., communication of aggregated sites information between retailers and distributors, compensation methods, etc.) and what changes would need to be made to Rule 021.
- Based on discussions held through the micro-generation working group, AESO staff brought forth a number of proposed changes to be considered by the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group.

Enrollment mechanics:

- The group contemplated whether the enrollment mechanics for aggregated sites should be more of a manual process, or an automated process. A number of stakeholders indicated that the frequency of aggregated sites may not be very high and therefore did not think that the creation of new automated transactions (which would require system costs) would be necessary at this time. Stakeholders also expressed that there would need to be an agreement made regarding what would be a fair turnaround time to process an enrollment for grouped sites, and what a reasonable timeframe would be to review enrolments, and identify whether a site was missed in error. In order to better understand the viewpoints of stakeholders, AUC staff asked that parties provide their feedback to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca on these discussion points by May 31, 2017.

-

ACTION: In relation to Rule 021 Section 7.4 Enrolment mechanics, stakeholders to comment on their preferred option and provide the estimated cost of each option to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017:

- **If more of a manual process was used (e.g. grouped sites identified by cluster correlation key are filtered out into a separate enrolment queue), stakeholders to comment on how many days would be a fair turnaround time to process an enrollment for grouped sites and what timeframe (e.g., bi-weekly, monthly, etc.) should be used to review those type of enrollments to ensure that a site(s) from the group was not missed in error.**
- **If an automated enrolment process was used for grouped sites, stakeholders to comment.**

Site ID catalogue:

- As discussed with the micro-generation working group, the AESO presented two options for how Section 9.4.6.14 SID ID catalogue transaction (SID) within Rule 021 could accommodate aggregated sites. Based on the feedback received, there appeared to be a split preference between the two options.

			Proposed changes
34	Micro-generator Indicator (Option 1)	Char(1)	Mandatory Field – Y – Micro-generator is commissioned N – Micro-generator is decommissioned or does not exist. P – Grouped (Parent) site, every site in that grouping has the parent site id included in the correlation cluster key (sequence 31), including the parent. C – Grouped (Child) site, every site in that grouping has the parent site id included in the correlation cluster key (sequence 31), including all children.
34	Micro-generator Indicator (Option 2)	Char(1)	Mandatory Field – Y – Micro-generator is commissioned. In the case of a Grouped site, this would be the (Parent) site it and this same site id would be included in the correlation cluster key (sequence 31) N – Micro-generator is decommissioned, does not exist or is a (Child) site of a group. In the case that it is a child site, the (Parent) site id is included in the correlation cluster key (sequence 31)

AUC staff asked that parties provide their feedback to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017, regarding which of the two options they preferred and how much it would cost to implement each option.

ACTION: In relation to Section 9.4.6.14 SID ID catalogue transaction (SID) – process rules and content, stakeholders to comment on which of the two options they prefer and how much it would cost to implement each option. Feedback to be provided to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017.

Cluster Correlation Key:

- In relation to Rule 021, Section 9.4.6.14 SID ID catalogue transaction (SID), there is also a provision within Rule 021 which requires that the SID file be refreshed weekly at a minimum. Taking into account the proposed changes below to the Cluster Correlation Key:

			Proposed changes
31	Cluster Correlation Key	Number(13)	Conditional field - Required if the site is part of Grouped Sites for micro-generation, otherwise, this field is optional. Identifies the parent site id of Grouped Sites that must be enrolled or de-enrolled jointly

AUC staff asked that parties provide their feedback to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017, on whether there should be a change to the required minimum amount of time that a SID file is refreshed.

ACTION: Taking into account the proposed changes to the Cluster Correlation Key, stakeholders to comment on whether there should be a change to the required minimum amount of time that a SID file is refreshed. Feedback to be provided to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017.

5 Update Customer Information (UCI) working group – update from ATCO Gas

- As per the last meeting, it was agreed that a UCI working group be established to discuss potential improvements to the UCI transaction.
- ATCO Gas staff provided an update regarding the discussions from the first UCI working group meeting which was held on April 21, 2017. A summary capturing the discussions of the meeting was circulated to the UCI working group by ATCO Gas staff. Those who were not part of the discussions asked if they could see a copy of the meeting summary, to which the working group agreed yes. AUC staff committed to sending a copy of the UCI meeting summary to the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group.

ACTION: AUC staff to send a copy of the April 21, 2017, UCI meeting summary to the Rule 021 and Rule 028 working group.

- As noted by ATCO Gas staff, the meeting focused on identifying issues and gaps within existing UCI processes, rather than on decision making. Stakeholders provided their organization's perspective on the UCI and RUC transaction content as well as the process rules. Overall, there was good discussion about the interpretation of the UCI and RUC transactions process rules and content.
- As a follow-up to some of the discussions held at the UCI working group meeting, AUC staff asked retailers to comment on their internal processes in addressing the following:
 - Rule 021 Section 9.6.3.1(3) and Rule 028 Section 8.6.3.1(3) – SRR
 - (3) If the UCI in question is rejected by the WSP, **the retailer must send a corrected UCI within one business day of the effective date of the enrolment.** For example, if a site becomes effective at 00:00 on March 27, and the UCI is rejected due to transaction errors, the retailer must send a corrected UCI by 00:00 on March 28.
 - Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.1(3) and Rule 028 Section 8.6.4.1(3) – UCI
 - (3) Update/refresh mechanism: whenever any of the information listed below is known by the retailer to have changed, **the retailer is required to resend all of the data to ensure data is not lost.**
 - Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.2(1) and (2) and Rule 028 Section 8.6.4.2 (1) and (2) – RUC
 - (1) The RUC may be sent by a distributor if the distributor suspects that the customer information for a specific site is not up to date, and the distributor is, therefore, requesting the retailer send a UCI.
 - (2) The distributor must specify which site IDs require the new UCI. The retailer must respond within five business days of receiving the request by providing a new UCI or by contacting the distributor by email to advise that no new information is available.
- Below includes a summary of the feedback received from stakeholders:
 - **ENMAX Customer Care:**

When ENMAX Customer Care receives a rejected UCI from a distributor, its process is to manually look at the data. When it receives a RUC from a distributor, its response is automated. Anytime there is an update made to a customer's information, its system recognizes the update and automatically triggers a UCI.
 - **UtilityNet:**

UtilityNet uses a manual process when it receives a rejected UCI or a RUC from a distributor. When it receives updated customer information, it automatically sends an updated UCI. When there is a case of a rejected UCI with an SRR, it will investigate these cases.
 - **Direct Energy:**

When Direct Energy receives a RUC from a distributor, it manually investigates it. Since it is a manual process, Direct Energy is a strong advocate that the volume of RUCs sent in one day cannot be more than 25. When Direct Energy receives new customer information, it is now an automated process, and an updated UCI is sent. If

- the UCI is rejected with the SRR, it depends on the error code received whether it gets investigated or not.
- **ATCO Energy:**

ATCO Energy uses a manual process to review rejected UCIs and RUCs. In some cases, it expressed that the requirement to send a new UCI within one business day can be hard to achieve, as there are cases which require a lot of investigation (e.g., phone number is wrong or missing). Currently, its system does not automatically produce an updated UCI when there is a change to a customer's information. Its staff are required to manually press a button to trigger an updated UCI.
 - **ALBERTA UTILITY BILLING (AUB)**

In response to a rejected UCI or RUC, a manual process is used. The requirement to send UCI within one business day is sometimes impossible if a lot of investigation is required. When customer information is updated, a UCI is not automatically produced currently. AUB is looking into automating the UCI to be sent out when new information has changed.
 - **ENMAX Commercial:**

Enmax's process is similar to UtilityNet. It also concurred with the comment made that the requirement to send a new UCI within one business day appeared to be a tight turnaround time, and should be changed to at least five business days.
 - **EPCOR Energy:**

When EPCOR Energy receives a failed UCI, its process is to manually review them on a daily basis. When an update is made to any of the fields within the UCI, its system automatically sends an updated UCI. When it receives a RUC, its process is also manual. It also expressed similar comments made, that the requirement to send a new UCI within one business day may not always work as there are situations where it may take longer than one business day to retrieve the updated customer information.
 - **EQUUS:**

When EQUUS receives a failed UCI, its process is to manually review them. EQUUS staff advised that would need to follow up on how RUCs and updated UCIs are handled, and would let the AUC know.
 - **Cognera:**

Cognera uses a manual process when it receives a rejected UCI or a RUC from a distributor. If updated customer information is not readily available, sending a new UCI may fall beyond the one business day timeline.

ACTION: EQUUS staff to follow up on its internal processes in addressing Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.1(3) and Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.2(1) and (2). This information to be provided to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca.

- AUC staff advised that it would follow up with those retailers who were unable to attend the meeting regarding their internal processes in addressing the highlighted sections discussed above.

ACTION: AUC staff to follow up with those retailers who were unable to attend the May 16, 2017, Rule 021 and Rule 028 Industry Consultation meeting, regarding how their organization addresses the following:

•Rule 021 Section 9.6.3.1(3) and Rule 028 Section 8.6.3.1(3) - SRR

•Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.1(3) and Rule 028 Section 8.6.4.1(3) - UCI

•Rule 021 Section 9.6.4.2(1) and (2), and Rule 028 Section 8.6.4.2 (1) and (2) – RUC

- ATCO Gas staff noted that the next UCI working group meeting would be held on June 1, 2017. Those stakeholders who were not already part of the working group, but would like to participate in future discussions, were asked to contact Christine Lott at Christine.Lott@atco.com.

6 Erroneous enrolment process – UCA proposed changes to Section 7.4(6)(b) of Rule 021 and Section 7.3(7)(b) of Rule 028

- During the last meeting, stakeholders that wished to propose draft language around changes to the erroneous enrollment process in the rule, were asked to provide their proposed changes to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca, prior to the next meeting.
 - UCA staff had provided suggested changes to the language in Section 7.4(6)(b) of Rule 021 and Section 7.3(7)(b) of Rule 028 (which were circulated to the group in advance of the meeting) in order to reflect the email process which had been introduced as a result of earlier discussions regarding how to improve the issue of erroneous enrolments. The group agreed that the UCA’s suggested changes would be included in the proposed changes table for Rule 021 and Rule 028 and stakeholders would comment on these suggested edits during the fall rule review process.

ACTION: AUC staff to incorporate the following change in the draft proposed changes table for Rule 021 and Rule 028:

Section 7.4(6)(b) of Rule 021 and Section 7.3(7)(b) of Rule 028 – When the LSA discovers that a retailer has potentially erroneously enrolled a site, the LSA shall provide notification simultaneously to notify both the retailer(s) affected, including the retailer that has potentially erroneously enrolled a site and the previous retailer, within one business day of the discovery of the potential error. The retailer(s) that has potentially erroneously enrolled a site shall investigate whether the site ID or the service address was erroneously enrolled and respond simultaneously to the LSA and the other affected retailer within five business days, confirming or denying that the site was erroneously enrolled.

- Similar to previous discussions, stakeholders continued to express that they were still experiencing some cases where the previous retailer was not picking up the site within the timeframe specified, causing the retailer to revoke the initial DSR from reason code “0003” to reason code “0002”. Further, in some cases, retailers are not receiving SROs required by their system. Both AUC and AESO staff reminded stakeholders that if they continued to run into issues related to erroneous enrolments, a report should be put forward to both the AUC and the AESO so that both organizations could look into how the issue could be remediated.

7 Other issues

Rule 021 – Non-standard SCA transaction discussion – Raised by EQUUS

- As noted last meeting, EQUUS staff agreed to take discussions offline with the appropriate stakeholders regarding the non-standard SCA transaction which was developed by FortisAlberta for REAs.
- EQUUS staff indicated that since FortisAlberta had re-designed its load settlement system, Fortis appeared to be moving away from using the SCA transaction.
- Discussions had been initiated between EQUUS, FortisAlberta, Battle River and Alberta Utility Billing to discuss the SCA transaction in further detail. Stakeholders who were interested in taking part in the discussions were asked to email Ralph Steendam at RSteendam@equs.ca.

ACTION: Stakeholders who would like to take part in discussion regarding the SCA non-standard transaction are to email Ralph Steendam at RSteendam@equs.ca.

Transfer of Site ID Catalogue, Standard Codes, Tariff bill calendar file and Site cycle catalogue file through VLTrader

- Discussion ensued regarding whether additional information, such as the Site ID Catalogue, Standard Codes, Tariff bill calendar file and Site cycle catalogue file should also be sent through VLTrader in addition to being posted on distributor’s websites.
- Stakeholders expressed that although this information was already being made available on distributors’ websites, this information can be difficult to locate (e.g., due to changes in website or broken links, etc.). It was also expressed that looking for this information is a manual and time confusing effort and may be more efficiently communicated through VLTrader.
- AUC staff asked that stakeholders provide their feedback to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017, on if they think this information should be sent through VLTrader and how much it would cost (if there was an additional cost) to send this information through VLTrader.

ACTION: Stakeholders to comment on whether the following information should also be sent through VLTrader (in addition to it already being made available on distributors' websites): Site ID Catalogue, Standard Codes, Tariff bill calendar file, Site cycle catalogue file, and the cost (if there is an additional cost) to send this information through VLTrader. Feedback to be provided to regulatorypolicy@auc.ab.ca by May 31, 2017.

Next meeting to be scheduled for September 2017.