

## SSC Working Group Meeting May 25 Meeting Summary

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Wednesday, May 25, 2011	<b>Time</b>	10:00 – 12:30
<b>Location</b>	AUC Offices 4 Floor, 425 1 St. SW, Calgary 10 Floor, 10055 106 St, Edmonton	<b>Facilitator</b>	AUC Staff

### 1 Introductions:

Name	Company
Rob Thomas	AUC
William Chow	AUC
Anne Glass	AUC
Maria Baitoiu	AUC
Raymond Lee	AUC
Mike Choboter	AESO
Lorne McKay	ENMAX Power
Paul Lindsay	ENMAX Power
Lori Harnack	Cognera
Angela Corsi	ForitsAlberta
Ashley Monahan	Direct Energy
Brian Neufeld	ENMAX Encompass
David Lenz	Valeo Power
John Hutchison	Valeo Power
Ralph Steendam	Central Alberta REA
Shun Fung	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission
Naomi Broni	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Joel Milne-Epp	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Chad Crossland	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Nap Pepin	ATCO Electric
Bruce Ramsay	ATCO Electric
Carol Benoit	ATCO Gas
Bettyann Skagen	Battle River REA (phoned in)
Misti Jeter	EC Power (phoned in)
Laurie Rennich	AUMA (phoned in)

### Addition to the agenda:

- The AUC mentioned that the report to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General in regards to the public fatality inquiry into the death of John Davis was released, and it contained recommendations specific for the AUC in relation to cut offs for nonpayment (CONPs). Also, Bill 16 gives the AUC the authority to direct utilities to amend their T&Cs. A new process or rule must be in place before the next winter moratorium to deal with CONPs which will require inputs from the Privacy Commissioner as well as stakeholders. It is

expected that the AUC will take a more lead role to charter the project rather than seeking consensus through a working group.

- The AUC reminded parties that they have until the end of this week to comment on the draft minutes for April 27, 2011 meeting.

## 2 UCI transaction issue (raised by Cognera)

- Cognera raised a question regarding the field 98 (Alternate Contact) from the UCI transaction as they received a question from a distributor asking what they intend to populate it with and in what format (e.g. first name, last name) and whether they would be submitting large volumes of replacements UCIs. Cognera brought these questions to the SSC Working Group in order to facilitate consistency.
- EPCOR Energy stated that they will populate the field with FIRST NAME SPACE LAST NAME, that they will truncate the name after 50 characters and that they will send UCIs populated with that field on a go-forward basis.
- The group agreed that FIRST NAME SPACE LAST NAME would be a good rule, but other retailers were not certain of their specifics. It was also suggested that the specifics be written into the rule.

**Action: Retailers should go back to their shops and investigate if they plan to populate the field on a go-forward basis or send batch transactions with the new information. Also, they should investigate if their systems will support the format proposed (FIRST NAME SPACE LAST NAME) and truncation after 50 characters.**

## 3 Rule 021 (Version 2.1)

- **PFAM implementation**
  - The AUC summarized a number of recommendations agreed to during a recent teleconference regarding PFAM implementation issues. Examples for clarification were also provided by the AUC. The key recommendations were:
    - When a post-final error is identified for a site after a post-final error had previously been identified, the actions to be taken depend upon whether the previous error was material or not. If the previous error was material and RSAs were created, those RSAs are not cancelled and replaced but new RSAs are created taking into account the net effect of the previous RSAs (whether those RSAs were marked as eligible for financial adjustment or not). If the previous error was not material, and, therefore, RSAs were not created, the new RSAs are created by comparing the new information with the originally billed information.
    - The group decided that LSAs are free to use the daily profile provided they identify this as part of their processes that will be documented on the AUC website.
    - For meter reads that come in after final settlement run in October, the LSAs have a choice of whether they create an automatic PFAM or not. However, everyone will wait until November 1, 2011 before they create RSAs in the new format. After November 1, 2011 all RSAs will be in the new format, including ones identified before November 1, 2011.
  - The group agreed that the recommendations made by the subgroup should be adopted as recommended. The group also agreed that there would be benefit to documenting this, along with the examples, in Rule 021 in an appendix.

- The AUC also reported that during the PFAM implementation meeting, the group discussed the new RSA changes being considered by the Transaction Working Group (further discussion to follow).

**Action: The AUC to distribute the meeting summary from the PFAM meeting to SSC working group.**

#### 4 Upcoming changes (Version 2.2)

##### ▪ Transaction Working Group update

- The Transaction Working Group (TWG) presented their 14 recommendations. The SSC Working Group agreed with most of the recommendations, but there was some discussion about a few of the items.
- The group agreed that the file extension (.csv) could be either upper or lower case letters but not a mixture of the two (.CsV). Parties have to accept both file extensions (upper or lower), but the transaction abbreviations in both the transaction file name and in the record must be in upper case.
- Also, the group agreed to change wording for the RSA and RAM submissions to make it clear that the minimum submission is monthly; to modify description in tables A-14 and A-15 of the Transaction Working Group Recommendations to make the standard “within 5 business days”; and to make no changes to the use of business function ID.
- The Transaction Working Group proposed that two new fields be added to the RSA transaction (Zone ID and PFAM Adjustment Reason Code) and that the Section 5.3.8 be removed as PFAM Adjustment Reason Code would provide the necessary information to retailers. In order to avoid having to build the report required by Section 5.3.8, some parties suggested that the proposed changes to the RSA transaction be implemented at the same time as the changes that will be implemented November 1, 2011. The PFAM implementation issues group members had been tasked with checking with their IT shops to assess preferences as to whether or not to build all changes at once or to stage them. Among those parties that had checked with their IT shops, there was a split — some preferred all at once, and some preferred staging due to conflicting demands upon IT resources. The AUC decided then that the RSA changes would need to be implemented by January 1, 2012, and industry could be non-compliant with Section 5.3.8 for the brief period between November 1 and January 1.

**[After the meeting, parties that had expressed difficulties meeting the November 1 implementation date informed their IT shops of the January 1 implementation date, and those shops decided to work overtime and complete all the changes for November 1. The AUC will be informing the market place that the date will now be November 1, 2011 for all of the RSA changes (Version 2.1 and proposed). ]**

- Regarding the PFAM Adjustment Reason Code, one LSA indicated that they need “Other” to be added to the list. The group debated the value of having an “Other” as this would provide no information to the retailer. The LSA indicated that not having an “Other” option would delay processing of the RSAs or lead to selection of the incorrect reason code. The decision by the AUC was that there would be no “Other” reason code.
- Discussion regarding the ENR priority codes (Table A-13 of the Transaction Working Group Recommendations) and whether the timelines indicated in the descriptions are requested timelines or mandatory service levels required of the

distributors. One electricity distributor stated that for some of the sites in their territory it would be impossible to commit to a reconnect in less than 24 hours. Both gas distributors made similar statements. One recommendation was that, if the distributor could not meet the requested timeline, it would be the responsibility of the distributor to contact the retailer so as to inform the retailer of what was causing the delay. The AUC decided that the ENR priority codes recommended by the TWG would stand as recommended but that the processes and service levels surrounding energize requests would be dealt with in the new CONP rule.

**Action: The ENR service levels and processes will be addressed in the new CONP process or rule.**

- The group discussed Priority Code versus Requested Off Cycle Read Date fields. One issue outstanding is how a distributor should deal with the situation where they cannot read a meter on the requested off-cycle read date. The TWG stated that some distributors intend to fail the request, while others will hold on to it and try again.
- Concern was raised regarding setting the Retailer ID field as mandatory for the WSI and WCI transactions. It was suggested that the field should be conditional depending to which party it is sent, a retailer or a WSP. Currently, REAs would have the most experience in receiving the transactions as a WSP.

**Action: The LSAs with REAs (ATCO Electric and FortisAlberta) should look at their systems to confirm their current practice. REAs should confirm what they currently receive in the Retailer ID field when they receive transactions as the WSP. Affected parties have to put their comments in the RIM system (RIM Issue 472).**

- **Erroneous Enrolment and Energization (EEE) Working Group update**
  - The EEE group presented their latest updates. At a previous SSC Working Group meeting (March 30), the recommendation made by the EEE group to include meter number in the site catalogue was accepted. Since then FortisAlberta expressed concerns about doing so because of privacy. The issue will be discussed further at the next EEE meeting. Other proactive solutions, such as the integration of site ID and meter number in real estate sales documents and the enhancement of UCA website to include customer education, are in progress.
  - Regarding reactive solutions the EEE group has not yet reached any consensus.

## 5 Other new issues

- No further new issues were identified.
- On a go-forward basis it is expected to have fewer SSC meetings and use more the RIM system to raise and solve issues.
- The AUC will continue to send email updates when new issues are raised.

## 6 Next steps

- Next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, June 29, 2011. Agenda to follow.