

SSC Working Group Meeting October 27th Meeting Summary

Meeting Date	Wednesday, October 27, 2010	Time	10:00 – 1:30
Location	AUC Offices 4 th Floor, 425 1 St. SW Calgary 10 th Floor, 10055 106 St Edmonton	Facilitator	AUC Staff

1 Introductions

Name	Company
Rob Thomas	AUC
Anne Glass	AUC
Maria Baitoiu	AUC
Raymond Lee	AUC
Kirsty McDougall	AESO
Lori Harnack	Cognera
Lorne McKay	ENMAX Power
David Lenz	Valeo Power
John Hutchison	Valeo Power
David Hayes	Nexen
Maureen Jeske	Direct Energy
Michael Ly	AltaLink
Brian Neufeld	ENMAX Encompass
Lisa Lamers-Zuger	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission
Shun Fung	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission
Naomi Broni	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Eva Mo	EPCOR Energy Alberta Inc.
Chad Crossland	AltaGas Utilities Inc.
Bruce Ramsay	ATCO Electric
Nap Pepin	ATCO Electric
Kathy McCollum	ATCO Gas
David Jackman	FortisAlberta (Phoned in)
Ngan Duong	Just Energy (Phoned in)
Bettyann Skagen	Battle River REA (Phoned in)

2 Review of (September 29th, 2010) meeting summary

- AUC staff asked if stakeholders if changes/corrections were required for the last meeting summary. Stakeholders indicated that they have no issue. The meeting summary will be posted on the on the AUC’s website.

3 AUC Rule 021 (Version 2.1) – Stakeholder Consultation

- AUC staff consolidated all the stakeholders' comments into one document. For those proposed changes that received no comments from stakeholders, the changes would then be incorporated in the new rule as they were presented.
- Several comments were received and discussed as follows:
 - For section 4.4.4 Interim Settlement, parties proposed to move the Initial Monthly Settlement to no later than 7th business day as well as delaying the Interim Settlement to 16th business day. Discussion was made regarding the use of 7th business day for Monthly Settlement. AESO indicated that this change may impact their financial settlement and would check with the financial department to find out if this can be done. Stakeholders decided to review whether or not the timing proves to be a problem once the proposed settlement timing is implemented.
 - **Action:** AUC proposed to review this issue next year. Stakeholders agreed and decided to see whether or not the timing proves to have operational impacts to them with new rules. If impacts exist, proposed changes on the timing will be reviewed.
 - **Decision:** Proposed changes on settlement timing remains unchanged.
 - For section 4.6.4 Micro-Generation (MG), with respect to PFAM materiality threshold for large MG Discussion, it was suggested 100kWh for large MG sites. The justification is to match the site-level materiality threshold and stakeholders agreed that 100 kWh is a reasonable threshold.
 - **Action:** AUC will incorporate the PFAM materiality change to 100 kWh for large MG sites.
 - For section 4.6.4 (c) (ii), comments were received regarding the wording of the rules and a development of a new PFAM/PFEC form for use by MDM in re-stating the data for MG sites. For consistency and clarification purpose, AUC will make minor changes to enhance clarity of the rules. The need of a new form for MG sites will be reviewed by a sub-working group.
 - **Action:** AUC will
 1. replace the words “must be restated” to “must be cancelled and replaced”
 2. modify the sentence to clearly define the party needs to re-state the data, in a situation when MG errors are uncovered.
 - For section 5.3.1, comments were received regarding the wording of the rules and process for MDM in restating the data for MG sites.
 - **Action:** AUC will
 1. remove the word “only” from 5.3.1 (6)
 2. clarify existing micro-generation processes and recommend a sub-working group to tackle the error correction process for micro-generation sites in next year.
 - For section 5.3.3, comments were received regarding the materiality threshold for system level errors and minor wording changes of the rules. Stakeholders voiced their materiality opinions, ranged from +/- 1 MWh to +/- 20,000 MWh. Subsequent to

all discussions, stakeholders agreed to make the system-level PFAM materiality threshold at 100 MWh.

- **Action:** AUC will
 1. change the system-level PFAM materiality threshold to 100 MWh. For large micro-generation, the threshold will remain at 100 kWh.
 2. change the word “+/100 kWh or more” to “+/- 100 kWh or greater”, for consistency purpose
 3. replace the words “ net difference” with “net difference in usage”
 4. remove the words “the LSA and AESO” in section 5.3.3 (3), as these entities do no received GIM transactions
 5. clarify the GIM transactions will be produced in association of large MG sites only

- For section 5.3.5 processing of PFAM adjustments, discussions were focusing on the consolidated RSA, RSA preparation date, RSA reporting to retailers, RAM transaction, clarity of credit/debit adjustments and the incorrect use of the PFAM process to obtain meter reads and timing of debit adjustments.
 - **Action:** AUC will
 1. modify the rules to accommodate the need of consolidated RSA
 2. draft an introduction paragraph to explain RSA and RAM transactions and parties involved in the PFAM process. Draft will be circulated among all stakeholders for comments
 3. consult its communication department with respect to the usage of “is” or “are” for the statement of “where the kWh final settled are...” in section 5.3.5.2
 4. modify the rules to reflect the PFAM adjustment period will go back to the beginning of the calendar month that is 8 years prior to when the RSA is being prepared.
 5. issue an interpretation bulletin to explain the intent of the PFAM process is to correct errors after the final settlement, should party misuse the PFAM process to obtain meter reads.

- For section 5.3.8 PFAM Reporting to Retailers, regarding a date for LSA in sending the RSA summary report to retailers, it was suggested that the report to be sent after each transaction, or after 48 hours or the 4th, 5th business day after the final. Stakeholders agreed to have the report sent to retailers no later than the 10th business day of the month. In addition, stakeholders agreed to have a standardized reporting template. ATCO Electric will craft a draft template and bring this to the Transaction Working Group for review.
 - **Action:** Transaction Working Group (TWG) is tasked to review the template and will report back to the SSC Working Group. ATCO will craft a template and present to the TWG.

4 Settlement Timing Transaction

- AUC circulated a 9-option survey to stakeholders in canvassing the preferred option for the settlement timing transition. Twelve stakeholders responded and the most popular options selected were Option # 8, 7, 3. Based on results, the preferred option is #8 (proposed by EPCOR Energy). Discussions arise for the datelines for the months with multiple runs in the same one.

Action: Option #8 will be implemented. New settlement timing will fully be implemented by the end of Oct, 2011.

5 Working Groups Updates

- **Transaction Group:**

- The next scheduled meeting will be held on October 28, 2010. The group will continue the thorough review of the fields and determine the required status (i.e. Optional, Mandatory or Conditional)
- As discussed under Rule 021 finalized changes above, ATCO will develop a template for PFAM reporting to retailers using a standardized CSV file.

- **DropChute Group:**

- AUC made an update mentioning that parties responded for RFI and there were in total 11 participants but only 10 responded. Consultant is reviewing and tabulating the results obtained from the RFI. Reviewed results will be presented at the next DropChute meeting. The next step will be issuing an RFP to prospective vendors.

- **Erroneous Enrollment Group:**

- At the last meeting, the objectives and the scope of work have been discussed.
- Some issues were raised but were determined should be assigned to other working groups. One example was the energization associated with non-payment or “regrettable enrolments”.
- The group mentioned that cases where customers physically move and need to be enrolled and energized, or when site IDs are incorrectly assigned will be part of their scope.
- Also, at their last meeting, UCA raised an issue of lengthy enrolment periods (i.e. 2-90 days). The group decided to review when there are erroneous errors associated with the period, but will not look to shorten the period. The later could be addressed by other groups.
- It was also suggested that the terms and conditions for distribution and retailers can be reviewed and that there is an opportunity to be standardized.

6 Other Issues

- **Rule Issue Management (RIM)**

- The application is up and running and ready to go and it should be used for logging issues
- The application can be found on AUC website and the parties can log on from EPS system.
- When logging issues, stakeholders are requested to use the same naming convention, such as:
 - If issue is related to Rule 021, simply start with rule number as follows:

“021 – issue title”

- If issue is related to Rule 004, simply start with rule number as follows:

“004 – issue title”

- Enmax raised a concern regarding the July 1, 2011 date for implementation and suggested again it might be a stretch for them.
- AESO mentioned that not sure either if they can meet the July 1st date for system changes, due to fact that Rule 021 must be approved first.
- At the last meeting (September 29, 2010), stakeholders were asked to provide their company-specific information contained in the Rule 004 appendices. AUC reminded stakeholders to follow-up with this request.

Action: Parties to follow up on this, and notify AUC even if there are no changes required.

7 Next Meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, November 24, 2010.