

Revision of AUC Rule 022, Rules on Intervener Costs  
Comments Matrix - May 8, 2008

Party	Role of the UCA
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA should be primary intervener for groups it represents, giving fair warning to other parties of its position.</li> <li>• Where a party wishes to take a different view, has onus to provide input that is helpful to the Commission</li> <li>• Commission must improve the intervener declaration process</li> <li>• No obligation for the UCA to work with all other interveners in matters before the AUC</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA and other interveners representing similar groups should bear the cost of determining how their positions vary.</li> <li>• Pre-approval for other interveners through demonstrating the value they intend to bring and how position differs from UCA prior to cost recovery.</li> </ul>
AltaLink, Alberta Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta, AltaGas Utilities, BP Canada, City of Calgary, City of Edmonton, City of Red Deer, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, D410 Group, Direct Energy, ENMAX, FortisAlberta, Gas Alberta, Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta, Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta, Independent Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All legitimate interveners should be given every opportunity to be heard and recover costs; UCA should not take precedence</li> <li>• Appropriate for AUC to require intervener groups to demonstrate who they represent and how their participation may differ from other similar groups.</li> </ul>

Producers Society of Alberta, Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta, Strathcona County	
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AUC could sponsor initial meetings between UCA and interveners for discussion of positions to try to reach consensus.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the UCA's governance structure.</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA should not receive special treatment/status from AUC.</li> <li>• Feels UCA should discharge their specific utility hearing intervention mandate by monitoring hearings and supporting independently guided interventions as per the original MOU negotiated between interveners and UCA</li> <li>• UCA should be required to demonstrate how it's proposed intervention reflects its willingness to work with independent interveners, provide full justification for any variance between its projected budget and actual costs, and AUC Cost Order should provide an assessment as to whether the UCA's intervention was effective and in the customer's best interests.</li> <li>• Where a conflict of interest arises among groups represented by the UCA, parties should attempt to resolve disputes initially amongst themselves but with recourse to the AUC or a formal and independent process to assist in solving disputes.</li> </ul>
Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA should perform advisory and resource function only, and should shoulder any significant expert and consultation costs that are not within the budget of these consumer groups.</li> </ul>
City of Edmonton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient time would be needed to review UCA filings; otherwise an unfair request.</li> <li>• UCA should make its positions on issues within each proceeding widely known to other interveners as soon as they have been approved by its Governance Board.</li> <li>• UCA Governance Board could resolve some conflicts of interest; alternatively adjudication by AUC must be an option.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflicts of interest should be considered on a case by case basis and remedied by the AUC as they see fit.</li> </ul>
EPCOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where groups represented by the UCA have a divergent view point from the UCA, UCA should be responsible for meeting with these groups in advance of any proceeding to reach a common position.</li> <li>• If a common position cannot be reached, expected the groups would address in any cost submission their participation and why the UCA could not adequately represent their interests.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA would provide more assistance if it assumed a leadership in pursuing issues that are of general interest to all customers included within its mandate.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues of interest to only one intervener and/or require the specific expertise of that intervener should not be handled by the UCA.</li> <li>• Open communication on issues is important to avoid duplication.</li> </ul>
<p>Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than undertaking an advocate role, UCA should act as ombudsman for smaller, mass market customers and facilitate broader policy initiatives.</li> <li>• Where parties' interests differ on specific issues, there should be open communication and coordination to resolve the issue.</li> <li>• AUC responsible for balancing divergent stakeholder positions.</li> <li>• Participation in utility proceedings and eligibility for cost recovery should be based on whether the party is affected by the application, whether the interests represented by the party are of broad impact and whether the party is subject to the Business Interest Rule</li> <li>• Suggests an approach taken by the NWT Utilities Board: consumer interveners file first set of Information Requests; any areas of concern that are not addressed are then addressed by the UCA.</li> </ul>
<p>The following parties did not provide comment on this issue: NOVA Gas and Western Export Group.</p>	

Party	Business Interest Rule (BIR)
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groups with diverse membership should have one agency undertake representation and spread costs to all benefitting customers by the cost recovery process.</li> <li>• Groups with a narrower range of members (either less geographically diverse, or simply a small number of members) and ability to fund intervention costs should be responsible for paying their costs.</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be designed to encourage meaningful participation</li> <li>• Cost recovery should be provided to Industry Associations not represented by UCA, where their membership could be significantly impacted by an application; dependent on avoiding duplicate efforts and value to proceeding.</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large business interests (defined by annual revenues or assets) representing their own commercial interests should not receive cost recovery; able to fund self.</li> <li>• Exempt municipalities, municipal associations, rural electrification associations, rural gas cooperative associations, irrigators, and public institutional consumers from BIR.</li> <li>• Utility applicants exempt from BIR as required to participate in own applications.</li> <li>• Grandfathering of existing groups is appropriate where there is longstanding representation and a significant if cost recovery not available.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a utility is obligated to represent themselves at hearings which may have an impact on existing or future regulatory environment in which they are required to operate, should be exempt from BIR .</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No BIR; all parties should be subject to same test for approving cost recovery.</li> </ul>
BP Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the status quo.</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties advancing positions which completely or significantly protect their business/commercial interests should not be allowed cost recovery; look to dominant purpose of intervention.</li> <li>• AUC should set out criteria for BIR; necessary to retain some flexibility, however.</li> <li>• No broader application to commercial associations unless clearly an attempt to exert a specific business interest.</li> <li>• No demonstrated need to grandfather parties who are clear exceptions to the rule</li> </ul>
City of Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR should only restrict interveners with commercial interests from receiving cost recovery.</li> <li>• Need for some flexibility in any criteria for application of a BIR.</li> <li>• Any standing party that can demonstrate a long history of regulatory interventions, focusing on issues that have benefitted customers across the province and across rate groups.</li> </ul>
City of Edmonton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties that are clearly competing with applicants should be excluded from cost awards.</li> <li>• Commercial associations should be eligible if they are active in a context that is not limited to sponsoring regulatory interventions.</li> <li>• No grandfathering.</li> </ul>

City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR of little value; not necessarily a consistent relationship between an intervener's motivation and an intervener's impact on the regulatory process.</li> <li>• AUC would still need to judge whether the intervener added value to the process where BIR doesn't apply.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR should apply to individual corporations pursuing a commercial interest.</li> <li>• BIR should apply as it did under the AEUB regime to associations; no need for broader application.</li> <li>• BIR should be developed in a manner that adheres to the following principles: interveners should address issues that may affect not only their members, but other customers generally in the same or similar customer classes, should combine efforts to minimize duplication, all interventions should be reviewed to ensure the AUC received value for the costs incurred by interveners in participating in the matters before the AUC.</li> <li>• Grandfathering not appropriate.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groups with independent financial means should be ineligible for cost awards, including municipalities, unions, commercial associations, and private companies.</li> <li>• Where a company is required by law to participate, the Hearing Cost Reserve Account should continue in place.</li> <li>• No grandfathering.</li> </ul>
ENMAX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties with a commercial interest in the outcome of the proceeding should be ineligible for cost awards.</li> <li>• Should also apply more broadly to include commercial associations whose individual members are ineligible.</li> </ul>
EPCOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR should apply to parties representing their commercial interest, and to larger commercial associations representing business interests of large commercial consumers.</li> </ul>
FortisAlberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for BIR application: (a) whether the intervener provided meaningful participation; (b) cost ineligibility for monitoring proceedings; (c) no duplication among interveners; (d) different rules for participation in Phase I and Phase II applications; and (e) distribution utilities that represent the interests of customers should be eligible for cost awards if their participation reduces costs or improves clarity for customers.</li> <li>• No grandfathering, although expected that existing groups would remain most useful to AUC due to experience.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be used to remove cost recovery for well-established intervener groups.</li> </ul>
Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR should not be changed</li> </ul>
Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports grandfathering for longstanding organizations that have demonstrated their contribution to the hearing process.</li> <li>• Efficiency of process in funding an association designed to provide collective advocacy</li> </ul>
Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR should not apply to commercial associations as all associations advocate for broad principles.</li> <li>• AUC discretion a more efficient approach rather than setting out criteria or grandfathering particular organizations.</li> </ul>

NOVA Gas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities should be eligible as these costs are legitimate costs of doing business in a regulated environment</li> </ul>
Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should continue existing BIR; encourages coordination of parties.</li> <li>• Some areas where AUC discretion should be exercised to expand availability of funding beyond established criteria.</li> <li>• Grandfathering of provincial organizations with well-recognized and demonstrated histories of reasoned and useful interventions, also where an intervener represents a significant portion of consumers within a utility's service territory, or a unique class of customers.</li> </ul>
Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligibility should not be based on predetermined intervener classifications.</li> <li>• Grandfathering existing groups would be inappropriate.</li> </ul>
The following parties did not provide comment on this issue: AltaLink, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, and Strathcona County.	

Party	Budgets
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More beneficial to provide detailed information post-proceeding.</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association, City of Calgary, ENMAX Power, Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports current budget process</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta, ATCO Utilities, AltaGas Utilities, Direct Energy, EPCOR, FortisAlberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All parties, including UCA, that intend to be active participants in the hearing should be required to submit a budget for costs, regardless of whether or not they intend to claim for costs.</li> </ul>
BP Canada, City of Edmonton, City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-hearing budget not sufficiently beneficial.</li> <li>• Detailed cost submissions at end of proceeding more useful.</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No pre-hearing budget; instead, have experienced interveners provide estimates of their resource deployment and a statement of the areas of concern to their constituency.</li> <li>• UCA should disclose the costs of its interventions on a case by case basis, and the AUC comments on each matter should be contained in the AUC cost order.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget should not be required for parties that are not eligible for costs.</li> <li>• All interveners should be required to provide an issues list to assist with minimizing duplication.</li> <li>• AUC should provide a form that outlines the issues identified by the AUC that interveners could respond to with any additional issues and their budget estimates would be helpful.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current practice requires too much detail; budgeting process should be streamlined.</li> </ul>
Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Filing of budgets should only be a requirement in proceedings that are likely to generate significant intervener costs</li> <li>• Difficult to provide precision pre-hearing; should not be the primary indicator for identifying potential overlaps.</li> <li>• Budgeting process for interveners does provide AUC with opportunity to flag budgets that may appear to have a large element of risk for recovery.</li> </ul>

<p>Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prudent to continue to request budgets in advance of a proceeding from all parties including utilities.</li> </ul>
<p>Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgets should be filed; major variances between budgets and final cost submissions should be explained as part of any final cost submission.</li> <li>• May be more beneficial to file budgets after the filing of intervener evidence, or alternatively, file update budget later in the process.</li> </ul>
<p>The following parties did not provide comment on this issue: AltaLink, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta, NOVA Gas, and Strathcona County.</p>	

Party	Scale of Costs
	There was a general consensus among all commentators that the Scale of Costs rates must be updated to reflect current market rates for the services of legal counsel and experts. The majority of commentators also agreed that the Scale should apply to pre-hearing technical workshops and collaborative processes. Further comments are as follows:
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rates should be structured to encourage early resolution by collaborative processes and/or negotiated settlements</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation time must be examined on a case-by-case basis rather than attempting to apply a formula.</li> <li>• AUC must ensure there are no other artificial restrictions to full intervener participation.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests greater transparency of the overall manner of cost recovery.</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of Costs should not limit the preparation time claimed based on number of hearing days.</li> <li>• Costs of hearing preparation should be recovered by a participant on basis of value of participation</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs of each process and value of each participant must be assessed on its own merits</li> <li>• Must also address transcript costs; AUC should purchase the rights to the transcript and post for electronic retrieval.</li> <li>• Cost recovery should generally be available to interveners in all steps of all AUC processes.</li> </ul>
City of Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AUC will still have the ability to ensure costs are reasonable by reviewing the hours claimed.</li> </ul>
City of Edmonton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical workshops and collaborative processes should be considered with downward adjustments to reflect the difficulty of assessing individual contributions, and the possibly lower overhead associated with these processes.</li> <li>• Require more direct participation and observation by AUC staff to ensure that value is correctly determined.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of costs should not limit preparation time; varies from issue to issue.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to put any limitation on preparation time through cost awards.</li> </ul>
ENMAX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation time eligible for cost recovery should reflect the length and complexity of the application/hearing.</li> <li>• Individual awards for intervener preparation time should reflect the extent of the interest and the party's involvement.</li> </ul>
EPCOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review should ensure professional fees assessed would only be for work provided in a regulatory process.</li> <li>• Also suggests a review of maximum allowable claims for Disbursements.</li> </ul>
FortisAlberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of costs should be expanded to apply to pre-hearing technical workshops and collaborative processes.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not arbitrarily limit preparation time; formulaic rules not appropriate as proceedings shift.</li> </ul>
Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost recovery not required for participation in collaborative processes; carried out by business representatives and does not involve counsel or retention of experts; if parties feel funding is required, however, it would be a matter for discussion amongst those involved.</li> </ul>
NOVA Gas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of preparation time eligible for cost recovery should not depend on the number of hearing days/other criteria</li> </ul>

Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should consider whether time expended was reasonable for the work undertaken by a party and described in their cost justification and/or accompanying account.</li> </ul>
Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of costs should limit preparation time claimed based on the number of hearing days, but the ratio may need to be adjusted for particularly difficult proceedings.</li> </ul>
The following parties did not comment: BP Canada, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta, and Strathcona County	

<b>Party</b>	<b>Cost of Negotiated Settlements</b>
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AUC should penalize cost recovery where parties do not negotiate in good faith; a means of ensuring process moves forward.</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests a value rating by the peers in the group which forms part of the consideration for cost recovery amount</li> <li>• AUC should be involved to help facilitate and potentially mediate an acceptable outcome where parties seem unwilling to negotiate on certain points.</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost claim process should be essentially the same as AUC approved negotiated settlement process in lieu of litigation.</li> <li>• Transparency could be enhanced with AUC observers and requirement for essentially line by line resulting financial schedules filed with the AUC for review and approval.</li> <li>• Negotiated settlements could be limited to test year proceedings that follow a litigated test year proceeding.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the recovery of costs specific to the negotiated process</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change needed</li> <li>• For sake of transparency, AUC staff could serve as observers</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status quo works well; cost recovery process in NSP should receive scrutiny but must recognize a negotiation likely has different parameters than an adversarial hearing process.</li> </ul>
City of Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status quo should be maintained; an officer of the entity should be prepared to sign a statement stating what the utility has paid for its legal and outside consultant costs.</li> </ul>
City of Edmonton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of participants in the process should be determined by the AUC before the process begins</li> <li>• Some form of regular update communication by the negotiating group to the wider group of interested parties would improve the transparency of the process.</li> </ul>
City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AUC has the authority and means to reduce the likelihood that a negotiated settlement process begins despite having little or no hope of success.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be treated in the same manner as any other AUC proceedings.</li> <li>• Confidentiality must be kept in mind when discussing transparency.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIR and Scale of Costs should apply, with parties having to demonstrate they acted responsibly and cost effectively.</li> <li>• AUC staff attending negotiated settlements should provide comments and recommendations to the AUC in the review and determination of any cost awards.</li> </ul>

ENMAX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of Costs should apply; with option for cost recovery for experts to exceed the scale if all parties agree.</li> <li>• Should only be awarded where parties have participated in good faith and have demonstrated a determination to achieve a settlement.</li> <li>• In applications that proceed to hearing, the extent to which the AUC grants a cost award should reflect the extent to which the intervener participated in the hearing in an efficient and effective manner and assisted the AUC in its decision-making responsibilities.</li> </ul>
EPCOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should continue to deal with in the same manner as other litigated cost claims.</li> <li>• Beneficial for an AUC representative to provide relevant input and comment on the value provided by the parties.</li> </ul>
FortisAlberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current regime of AUC observer participation and settlement briefs largely sufficient; to improve transparency, attendance of observer could become mandatory.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be continued to be dealt with in same manner as for litigated cost claims.</li> <li>• Transparency comes from full disclosure; basis for the settlement should be set out clearly for the AUC and the general public to understand.</li> </ul>
Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not required for normal representation and participation in negotiated settlements, but there is merit to considering cost recovery for the complex/technical components.</li> <li>• Must remember, however, it's a voluntary process; lack of cost recovery for legitimate costs may become an incentive not to participate.</li> </ul>
Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement and its costs should likely continue to be included as part of overall process.</li> </ul>
Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs should be considered having regard to work completed by a party, the time expended on the task and whether it was beneficial in advancing the matter, regardless of whether an agreement is eventually achieved.</li> </ul>
Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No less valuable to AUC or parties than litigated proceedings.</li> <li>• Transparency concerns can be adequately managed; should not be necessary for parties to reveal confidential negotiating positions, but they should be required to demonstrate how the costs related to an activity benefitted the negotiation process overall.</li> </ul>
<p>The following parties did not provide comment on this issue: AltaLink, BP Canada, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta, NOVA Gas, and Strathcona County.</p>	

<b>Party</b>	<b>Proceedings Without Cost Recovery</b>
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive participation requires allowance of cost recovery in every proceeding.</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No cost recovery may be warranted where the impact of proceeding outcome does not impact a wide range of customers or does not have a material impact on any one party's costs.</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to generic proceedings, although time should always be provided for arguments for cost recovery.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where participation required by regulation, party should be eligible to recover all prudent associated costs.</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If participation in a proceeding has a potential impact on rates, costs should be recoverable through rates.</li> <li>• If AUC requires a party's participation, they should be able to apply for cost recovery.</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should only occur in very limited circumstances. The CCA cannot imagine such circumstances.</li> </ul>
City of Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision to disallow intervenor cost claims on matters that the AUC itself describes as having "significant, long-lasting implications for utility shareholders, investors and ratepayers" will be detrimental to the quality and quantity of substantive submissions.</li> </ul>
City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable for some proceedings where there is no direct or material impact on utility customers; AUC should announce in advance.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicable for applications addressing issues between utilities/generators, or commercial issues of interest to a limited number of entities, unless it impacts consumer end-use rates or raises issues that are important to the entire regulatory community.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of BIR should be sufficient; few if any proceedings should be undertaken with no cost recovery.</li> </ul>
ENMAX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AUC should have discretion to declare that parties will not be eligible for cost recovery so long as parties are notified of such at the beginning of a process.</li> </ul>
EPCOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate where AUC would be interested in receiving the view points on broad industry policy issues.</li> <li>• AUC would clearly outline this point in the notification.</li> </ul>
Gas Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denying cost recovery leads to demise of information processing and involvement by small interveners.</li> </ul>
Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicable to certain broad inquiries where scope of issues extends beyond a single group into non-utility issues.</li> </ul>

Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires establishment of criteria; proponent of cost recovery by rate class.</li> </ul>
NOVA Gas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eligibility for cost recovery a case-by-case, merit-based matter that includes a determination of whether costs were reasonably and prudently incurred in the particular circumstance</li> </ul>
Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines regarding minimizing duplication, BIR, and value of intervention are sufficient safeguards against unreasonable costs.</li> <li>Overriding principle should be the ability of parties to participate meaningfully in proceedings that could impact them adversely.</li> </ul>
Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should specify there will be no cost recovery at the outset.</li> <li>No cost recovery where only the interests of corporate parties or associations would be affected by the outcome.</li> </ul>
The following parties did not comment: AltaLink, BP Canada, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, City of Edmonton, FortisAlberta, Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta, and Strathcona County.	

<b>Party</b>	<b>Costs Officer</b>
Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where costs disallowed, affected party should be able to address findings of the Cost Officer.</li> <li>• Should play more of an audit role, ensuring there are no breaches of acceptable practices for cost recovery.</li> </ul>
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost Officer should notify interveners where duplication of efforts is observed that may impact cost recovery.</li> </ul>
Sugar Beet Growers/Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current cost process flawed as UCA is not included; leads to unnecessary duplication.</li> <li>• Where considering a major cost claim disallowance, AUC should request additional information prior to final cost order.</li> <li>• Transcripts should be purchased by AUC and made available online for intervener access.</li> </ul>
ATCO Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usefulness of Cost Officer depends on the role of the Officer relative to the overall manner and process of applications, budget submissions and cost recovery.</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same assessment process should apply to all participants in a hearing.</li> </ul>
BP Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost Officer may be useful, but ultimately the Panel must decide matters.</li> </ul>
City of Edmonton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost Officer should ensure cost claims are assessed in the context of the budgets submitted, the detail provided in the claim and the Panel's feedback on the intervener's contribution to the proceeding.</li> </ul>
City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost Officer should lead AUC's own internal processes and ensure consistency, but cannot take lead role in developing the cost order as he/she did not directly observe proceedings.</li> <li>• AUC must more effectively communicate the standards upon which cost submissions will be judged, with feedback provided to all participants.</li> </ul>
D410 Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having a designated Cost Officer that can oversee and administer the cost process and apply the AUC's rules in a fair and consistent manner desirable.</li> </ul>
ENMAX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function and performance of the Cost Officer has been useful and effective.</li> </ul>
FortisAlberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Useful in determining preliminary cost eligibility and would provide signal to parties to collaborate where it appears intervention is duplicative.</li> </ul>
Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that Cost Officer may not have direct knowledge of the value of a party's contribution or its value relative to that of another party whose costs may differ significantly.</li> <li>• Where a party's costs have been questioned by the AUC or others, the Cost Officer could conduct an informal hearing to provide the affected party an opportunity to address the concerns.</li> </ul>
Western Export Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination of assessment of Statements of Intent to Participate or budgets prior to the proceeding and cost claims following is important, but takes no position on whether Cost Officer is best suited for the role.</li> </ul>

The following parties did not comment: AltaLink, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, City of Calgary, Direct Energy, EPCOR, Gas Alberta, Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta, Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta, Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta, NOVA Gas and Strathcona County

<b>Party</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
Alberta Sugar Beet Growers/ Potato Growers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AUC should pay for the rights to transcripts and then post them on the AUC DDS or IAR systems for intervenor access due to the costs of transcripts.</li> </ul>
AltaGas Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AUC should issue clear notification of the end of proceedings and start of the 30 day period for cost submission.</li> </ul>
BP Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AUC should have the option of awarding a stipend to stakeholders who might otherwise be unable to participate in proceedings without cost recovery.</li> </ul>
Consumers' Coalition of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unique treatment for longstanding intervenors, although it must be handled cautiously to prevent prejudice to newer parties.</li> <li>AUC should make more frequent use of advance or interim funding of cost claims due to lag between commencement of a hearing and issuance of cost order.</li> </ul>
City of Red Deer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AUC should direct its efforts to the cost order as a tool to affect participant behaviour.</li> <li>AUC must more effectively communicate the standards upon which cost submissions will be judged.</li> <li>In some circumstances, it is appropriate for the AUC to direct some costs be entirely attributable to specific rate classes, particularly where a participant's contribution was sufficiently valuable, but overly narrow in scope.</li> </ul>
Direct Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulatory efficiency would be improved through the AUC's insistence on adhering to the issues list coupled with budget review in light of the issues list, effectively shifting the context of cost review to issues of importance.</li> <li>Generic proceedings for major issues may also improve regulatory efficiency.</li> </ul>
Public Institutional Consumers of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourages face-to-face dialogue between all industry stakeholders to discuss ways to improve regulatory efficiency, i.e., round table discussions facilitated by the AUC that are attended by key decision makers within the stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<p>The following commentators did not provide additional comment: Alberta Utilities Consumer Advocate, Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association, AltaLink, ATCO Utilities, Central Alberta Rural Electrification Association, City of Calgary, City of Edmonton, D410 Group, ENMAX, EPCOR, FortisAlberta, Gas Alberta, Industrial Gas Consumers Association of Alberta, Industrial Power Consumers Association of Alberta, Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta, NOVA Gas, Strathcona County, Western Export Group.</p>	