

**AUC Rule 021: Settlement System Code
Transaction Working Group Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Date	Thursday, February 10, 2011	Time	10:00 to 14:00
Location	ENMAX Place 141 50 AVE SE Calgary AB, T2G 4S7 Deerfoot Meeting Room	Facilitators	Raymond Lee and Paul Lindsay

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Raymond Lee	AUC	Naomi Broni	EPCOR Retail
Paul Lindsay	ENMAX Power	Maureen Jeske	Direct Energy
Chad Crossland	Alta Gas Utilities Inc.	Tina Dulgueroov	Fortis Alberta
Shun Fung	EPCOR Distribution		

Meeting Minutes:

1. Decisions Made To Date

For 2012 changes, the following decisions have been made

- Definition of Mandatory, Conditional and Optional
 - **Mandatory:** Required in transaction, data must valid and relevant.
 - **Conditional:** Populated according to stated production rules or specified in applicable transaction element sequence description
 - **Optional:** populated at participants discretion
- Agreement on transaction definitions and layout for transactions listed in the v4.0 Transaction Layout Document
- Agreement to add new Profile Class and Loss Class table to Rule 021 Appendix A
- Agreement to add footnote to ENR & DER sequence 9 & 10 that the contact name and telephone number are for the person to contact if an access related issue occurs

2. Issues Deferred to SSC Working Group

- The TWG deferred the issue of the use of the Critical to Have Power within the UCI transaction as it was felt this issued needed to be addressed by the main SSC working

group. The group noted that the Critical to Have Power does not have a standard applied to it. Some retailers use the field to advise of a customer with a medical condition, other use it because their customer needs power to 'run a business'

- The TWG deferred .CSV vs. .csv as it was felt this issued needed to be addressed by the main SSC working group.

3. AUC Update

- Raymond advised that other subgroups are making progress on the issues those groups are dealing with

4. Transaction Content Review

- Direct Energy advise the group that upon further inspection into the UCI, they discovered 25 records existed in UCI seq #98
- Direct Energy stated they would like to just delete this data
- TWG members all stated there was no impact to them
- Direct Energy advised they will proceed with deleting this data
- Fortis asked that in the WSI transaction, field element # 8 be a conditional field as opposed to a mandatory field
- Fortis advised that they discovered an issue for them regarding DCM sequence #12 (Max KW) being a conditional field
- Fortis advised that if a reading has a bad KW value the whole DCM is rejected by their system
- Fortis informed the group in this instance they would only pass on the KWH value
- Fortis asked that DCM fields 11 & 12 be made optional
- EPCOR Distribution felt this would not be an issue as settlement did not use KW or KVA
- ENMAX Power noted that they will continue to populate these fields in the DCM as their billing system required this information for billing demand metered sites
- Retailers stated they had no issue with the request as they get their meter reading info from the TBF not the DCM
- EPCOR Distribution noted that if element sequence 11 & 12 were made optional, element sequence 17 & 18 should be optional as these were the readings and you could not have consumption without a reading
- The group agreed to make element sequence 11, 12, 17 & 18 optional fields within the DCM transaction
- The group then reviewed the remaining element sequences in the UCI transaction
- The group agreed the following UCI sequences were optional; 65 through 97, 99 through 108
- The group agreed that sequence #98 was conditional
- Direct Energy stated while reviewing changes to UCI sequence #98 they discovered that they have two types of alternate contact, a billing alternate contact and a site alternate contact
- The billing alternate contact was generally a person who was calling about a billing issue while a site contact was generally a person who had access to a site
- EPCOR Retail stated they had issues with having an alternate contact in the UCI when enrolling a site back to the RRO as the customer info in the UCI was usually incorrect

- EPCOR Retail stated they would ignore the alternate contact listed in the UCI when enrolling a site back onto the RRO
- Direct Energy stated that ATCO Gas required the alternate contact because they speak to the customer for every service order transferred to them
- ENMAX Power, EPCOR Distribution and Alta Gas stated they will accept info put into this sequence but would not load or use the info
- Fortis stated they will use the info provided in the Alternate Contact field and would prefer site contact
- Alta Gas stated that in 90% of the cases the alternate contact is a residential customer so they would be both the billing and site contact
- The group agreed and decided to let retailers populate this field with the Alternate Contact info they feel is required
- The RUC transaction was then reviewed
- The group agreed that sequence elements 1 through 6 are mandatory and sequence elements 7 through 11 are optional

5. Site Metering Characteristics Process Rules

- The group reviewed the previous decision to include two footnotes into the SMC processing rules
- The footnotes were - Distributors are not required to send an SMC transaction on initial site enrollment where metering equipment does not exist but will exist when the site is initially energized. A distributor must maintain its current practice established as of January 01 2011
- Distributors are not required to send an SMC transaction if the end of day energization state is the same as the beginning of day energization state. A distributor must maintain its current practice established as of January 01 2011
- In the first footnote, Alta Gas asked how a retailer would know if a site was a new site not an existing site where the SMC was not generated by a distributor
- ENMAX Power responded that retailer could determine if a sites was new by the site id, EPC acknowledged this wasn't the easiest solution but their system could not create a SMC for a new site that was enrolled where no metering equipment existed
- Alta Gas asked how other distributors handled this situation
- EPCOR Distribution and Fortis both stated they send a SMC with a 'U' in the meter type field
- EPC stated that this practice wasn't accurate because the site would be metered but the site was in a transitional state
- EPC further stated that they felt their was no impact to the market as most retailers used the TBF file to get site metering characteristics
- Both EPCOR Retail and Direct Energy stated they use the SMC. EPCOR Retail has no sites in EPC service territories so there was no impact to them
- Direct Energy stated they have processes in place to handle the EPC issue and while they understood the system limitation EPC has, the SMC should be standardized
- Alta Gas also noted that distributors should be sending an SMC every time a socket status changes
- Alta Gas felt that no exemption footnotes should be added to the SMC production rules
- The AUC agreed stating that the rules are black and white and no exemptions should be provided

- EPC stated they were ok with removing the footnotes as they would deal with any information requests as they are received.
- EPCOR Distribution and Fortis both agreed.
- The group then agreed to remove the recommendation to add exemption footnotes to the SMC production rules.

6. Priority Code Action Item Discussion

- The group began discussion regarding priority code
- The group reviewed the responses from distributors regarding the action item of reconnecting a site within 24 hours
- EPCOR Distribution responded they could reconnect the majority of sites within 24 hours
- ENMAX Power stated they could as well
- ENMAX Power further stated that they would be willing to use priority codes if retailers were aware that EPC would charge a higher fee for urgent reconnects
- Direct Energy responded that would be fine as that was a service they would be willing to pay for
- Direct Energy further stated that most of their reconnect requests are for a standard level of service and they felt the use of an urgent priority code would be minimal
- Alta Gas stated they couldn't commit to a 24 hour reconnect due to the remoteness of some of their service sites
- Direct Energy stated ATCO Gas has the same issue as well as needing to speak to the customer and that priority codes would probably not work for them but since a gas settlement code was coming out it was possible that gas distributors could continue to use a request date
- The working group agreed with that assessment
- The group then agreed that nine priority codes were to many and that three would be sufficient
- EPCOR Distribution stated they have a new construction priority code they use and they needed to keep this
- The group agreed that four priority codes would be used and the definitions would be:
 - 1) Urgent Reconnect – Reconnect in less than 24 hours
 - 2) Rush Reconnect – Reconnect between 24 and 48 hours
 - 3) Standard Level Reconnect – Reconnect within 3 to 5 business days
 - 4) New Construction
- The group agreed that the requested date field in the ENR transaction would be an optional field

7. PFAM Reporting Transaction

- The SSC working group assigned a new PFAM Summary Reporting task to the Transaction Working Group
- ATCO Electric has provided an initial draft of a PFAM Monthly Reporting Transaction
- The group agreed that transaction should be in .CSV format as this was more preferable than receiving a report in various formats and layout from different distributors

- The initial draft transaction had eight element fields:
 - 1) Transaction Abbreviation
 - 2) Transaction Date Time
 - 3) PFAM Reporting Period
 - 4) LSA ID
 - 5) Retailer ID
 - 6) Site ID
 - 7) PFAM Reference Number
 - 8) PFAM Reason

- Direct Energy stated that the initial output looked good but they noted that the date format was not consistent with the date format in other transactions
- Direct Energy also stated that the transaction should also summarize volume, UFE and Losses
- Fortis stated that the transaction should also include a PFAM processing start and end date
- Fortis wondered if the transaction could possibly be based on the current PFAM summary report sent to the AESO
- The AUC stated they would like to get the AESO's input into the transaction and suggested that the proposed transaction be added into the RIM system
- The group agreed that the proposed transaction should be added into RIM for comments from participants that were not attending TWG meetings

8. Profile Class and Loss Class Reference Table

- ENMAX Power presented a draft profile and loss class reference table for Appendix A for the group to review
- The layout of the proposed reference table is:

Profile Class Reference Table

Zone ID	Profile Class	Profile Description
0501	CAL_RES	Residential
0501	CAL_NSLS	Small and Medium Commercial - Cumulative Metered
0501	INTERVAL	All interval metered sites
0501	CAL_STRTLT	Streetlights
0501	CAL_FLAT	Unmetered Sites

Loss Class Reference Table

Zone ID	Loss Class	Loss Class Description
0501	L100	Residential
0501	L200	Small Commercial
0501	L300	Medium Commercial
0501	L310	Interval Secondary
0501	L410	Interval Primary
0501	L500	Streetlight

- The subgroup agreed the layout was fine
- EPCOR Distribution asked if profile type could be added to the profile class reference table
- The subgroup agreed profile type should be added to the profile class reference table

9. RSA, TAA and RAM Issue

- ENMAX Power advised the working group of an issue with regards to the RSA, TAA and RAM transactions
- ENMAX Power advised that these transactions were missing a zone id element sequence
- ENMAX Power advised that the lack of a zone id in the transaction resulted in the AESO forcing EPC to use the LSA ID that corresponds to the settlement zone where the PFAM adjustment was being made. I.E. if correction was made to a Red Deer site, EPC was instructed to use LSA ID 1070 in RSA and RAM transactions
- EPC noted that this conflicted with the definition of a LSA in Rule 021
- EPC asked if the adding a zone id to the RSA, TAA and RAM transactions would cause any issues with other market participants
- EPC further stated that adding a zone id to these transactions would make them consistent other settlement transactions (SPI, WSI, WSD etc.)
- The working group noted that EPC was the only LSA that calculated settlement results for other zones and that they had no issue with adding a zone id element sequence
- The group agreed to add this new element sequence as an optional field to the RSA, TAA and RAM transactions.

10. Decision made at this meeting

- Agreement on new Profile Class and Loss Class table layout

- Agreement on meaning and standardization of priority codes (1 to 4) for ENR, DER & ROR transactions
- Agreement on all Rule 021 transaction content and layout
- Agreement to add optional zone id field to the RSA, RAM and TAA transactions
- Agreement not to add any footnotes to the SMC processing rules

11. Action Items:

- Distributors to provide profile class, profile types and loss class codes to Paul Lindsay so they can be incorporated into the new Profile Class and Loss Class Reference table

12. Next Meeting

- No meeting scheduled. Conference call will be held with TWG members to review transaction layout and PFAM Report Transaction