

SSC Working Group Meeting April 27 Meeting Summary

Meeting Date	Wednesday, April 27, 2011	Time	10:00 – 12:00
Location	AUC Offices 4 Floor, 425 1 St. SW, Calgary 10 Floor, 10055 106 St., Edmonton	Facilitator	AUC Staff

1 Introductions

Name	Company
Rob Thomas	AUC
William Chow	AUC
Anne Glass	AUC
Maria Baitoiu	AUC
Kirsty McDougall	AESO
Lorne McKay	ENMAX Power
Terry Ryan	ENMAX Power
David Jackman	FortisAlberta
Angela Corsi	ForitsAlberta
Maureen Jeske	Direct Energy
Brian Neufeld	ENMAX Encompass
Darel Davies	UtilityNet
Lisa Lamers-Zuger	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission
Shun Fung	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission
Naomi Broni	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Joel Milne-Epp	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Chad Crossland	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Juanito De Jesus	ATCO Electric
Bruce Ramsay	ATCO Electric
Andrea Hagan	ATCO Gas
Carol Benoit	ATCO Gas
Bettyann Skagen	Battle River REA (Phoned in)

2 Review of the March 30, 2011 meeting summary

- Parties were asked to comment on the draft summary for the March 30 meeting. Some mentioned they did not receive the minutes. The AUC resent the minutes to all parties for review and asked for their comments within a week.
- No comments were received; therefore the AUC will post the meeting summary on the AUC website.

3 PFAM adjustment timing

- The AUC delivered a presentation on PFAM adjustment issues that had been raised by industry: clarification of when an RSA is to be marked as eligible for financial adjustment, timing of when RSAs will be produced with net system load shape versus other profiling methodologies and profile freeze cutoff dates.
- It was agreed that for credit and debit adjustments the phrase “the date the data is corrected and the adjustment is processed” will be replaced by the phrase “the date the RSA will be published to market.”
- As an RSA transaction set can either be sent as it arises or batched and sent 8 days before the ISO final statement issue date, the AUC reviewed some examples of ISO final settlement issue dates and when the RSAs would then need to be submitted to the ISO.
- Examples of PFAMs due to late meter reads (Dec 5, 2010 to Dec 9, 2011) for two different profiles were provided. For a net system load shape profile site the cumulative meter read will be too late for August final settlement and the read cannot be profiled until December profile is created at the end of January 2012. Therefore, the RSAs can be produced early February, nearly two months after the read comes in.
- For a load research profile site with same read dates, the read could be profiled when it comes in, except for the statement in Rule 021, Section 6.1(2)(c) defining the profile freeze cutoff dates as: “for final settlement, the end of the last day of the third calendar month following the month being settled.” Section 6.1(2) states, “Because profiles are not used for days of flow past the profile freeze cutoff, cumulative meter reads that cover dates past the cutoff cannot be profiled, and such Sites are treated as though the cumulative meter read were missing for that MAAT settlement run...”
- Consequently, the read cannot be used for the final settlement run that will be run in December. So, December of the year before through July can be PFAM'd, but August would need to be final settled as if the read had not come in, and then at the end of January, September final settlement can use the new read, and RSAs can be produced for August in February. Alternatively, the LSA could wait until early February and PFAM December through August all at once—again, nearly two months after the read comes in.
- Discussion regarding whether Section 6.1(2) should be changed to allow the meter read to be used when is available. For the majority, the wording as it stands makes good sense. EPCOR, however, indicated that they do not follow the requirement of 6.1(2). In the example, EPCOR would produce RSAs for December through July right away and would use the new read for August final settlement. The group discussed whether EPCOR's approach is problematic. The group decided that, because EPCOR has only one profile, its approach makes sense. The AUC asked EPCOR to draft some wording for a revision to Section 6.1(2) explaining EPCOR's approach and that it would be an exception for those LSAs with only one profile.

Action: EPCOR to identify the specific wording changes required for its approach.

- The group discussed the lag period between when the meter read is available and the RSA gets produced. Parties agreed that if there is consistency and there is a maximum time limit within which the transaction gets sent, then they are okay with the lag.
- There was also identified the need to document everybody's practices so that retailers know what to expect.
- The AUC proposed that in Section 5.3.3(1)(c) where it specifies: "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 for one month after

identifying an error,” the phrase “for one month after identifying an error” be replaced by “after identifying an error until the LSA is able to process the RSA transaction set as per the LSA’s processes as identified on the AUC website.”

- Retailers proposed a maximum of two months limit to be added for section 5.3.3(1)(c). After further discussion the group agreed to add at the end the phrase “up to a max of x months”, where “x months” would be determined by AUC after review of distributors’ processes.

Action: The LSAs are to draft documents explaining their processes and when RSAs should be expected and provide the drafts to the AUC for distribution to the rest of the group by June 1. Final versions will be posted to the AUC website by November.

- Another issue discussed was what should occur when RSAs are produced for a site for a time period and later further corrections for a site for that time period are required. The AUC stated that RSAs cannot be cancelled. Instead a new adjustment would be made to the site taking into account the effect of the previous RSAs.
- AUC suggested that for additional PFAM implementation issues, AUC should schedule a conference call.

Action: The AUC will schedule a conference call meeting for a PFAM group to deal with issues arising from the implementation.

4 RIM issue discussion

- **Issue 471** – PFAM 100 kWh materiality limit
 - The issue has a resolution and will be closed. However, the word “eligible” should be removed as materiality test should be applied to the entire period already final settled and not just the eligible period.
- **Issue 472** – Transaction Working Group Recommendations
 - The 14 recommendations from the group were reviewed and some parties sent their comments on RIM. They acknowledged that they can incorporate the proposed recommendations but it will be an extra cost.
Discussion regarding the use of lower or upper case letter for CSV. file extension. Parties agree that both should be accepted. Distributors should provide the AUC with their procedures in order to be posted on the website.

Action: It was agreed that the issue regarding adding a reason code to the RSA transaction be further discussed in the next TWG meeting.

- Discussion around the mandatory and conditional status of the ID field in the RSA and TAA transactions, as in the presentation there were presented as mandatory but in the draft they were conditional.
- Concerns were raised regarding the status of class fields for WCI or WSD transactions and for retailer id and WSP id. Parties mentioned that they should be considered as conditional depending to whom they will be addressed.

Action: It was suggested that the issue be brought back to the TWG for discussion.

- **Issue 473** – Deemed time
 - It was decided that the Transaction Working Group would address this issue.

- On an ongoing basis, the AUC will detail the RIM issues and the issues will be discussed during each meeting.

5 Transaction Working Group's Recommendations

- Transaction Working Group (TWG) provided a presentation on their latest developments. The discussion was incorporated under issue 472 discussed above.

6 Sub-Working Groups Updates

- **DropChute Group:**
 - The AUC presented DropChute Replacement Group update. The AUC presented the two choices to the EAC meeting and will further present them, on May 6th, to Commission for a decision.
 - After the Commission decides on one option, the AUC will notify parties and will provide detailed documentation supporting the decision. An RFI will be sent at beginning of May in order to choose a third party to assist with the process. The third party work will be funded by AUC.
 - The next steps will consist in lab tests, user acceptance, further testing with parties and, if feasible, the implementation might be phase out.
 - Parties suggested that the word "DropChute" from Rule 021 be replaced by "file transfer solution or mechanism". This was rejected as new companies will need to know what software/system is required.

7 Rule 021 (Version 2.1) Implementation Update

- The AUC provided an updated implementation table with all datelines.
- Clarification was made regarding the implementation date for PFAM (November 1st).

8 Other

- Question about having a streetlight update.

9 Next meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, 25 May 2011. Agenda to follow.