

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

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Tuesday, January 11, 2011	<b>Time</b>	10:00 to 14:00
<b>Location</b>	EPCOR Centre 10065 Jasper Ave Edmonton AB, T5J 3B1	<b>Facilitator</b>	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
Brian Neufeld	ENMAX Energy	Tina Dulguerov	Fortis Alberta
Nap Pepin	ATCO Electric	Shun Fung	EPCOR Distribution
Kathy McCollum	ATCO Gas		

**Meeting Summary:**

**1. AUC Update**

- Raymond provided an update of AUC expectations for 2012 changes of the Rule 021.
- Other than those undertakings such as DropChute replacement, no significant changes are expect to the next version of the Rule 021.
- Direct Energy asked if this meant that the industry is taking a break to catch up
- The AUC replied that most major issues have been addressed in the past. If any issues arose over the next year, participants can use the RIM to bring up issues for discussions.
- The AUC also stated that it is ultimately their goal to have the Electric and Gas System Settlement codes combined into one rule.
- ATCO Electric stated they would like to have some WSP/REA transactions created, could this be done if the TWG is dissolved?
- The AUC replied that the TWG would not be dissolved, rather if any transaction issues arose the TWG could be reconvened and tasked to deal with those issues.

**2. Update on new TWG Item from SSC Working Group**

- The SSC Working Group assigned TWG to design a PFAM Summary Reporting Template for reporting purpose.
- Questions were raised about that 'Is an existing AESO report appropriate'?

- Could this report be made into a .CSV?
- ATCO Electric advised they were still working on this and hope to have a report framework ready by the next TWG meeting

### 3. Review of Action Items From Last Meeting

- *ATCO Electric to provide a framework for the PFAM summary report – Have not started on this task, will have an update at next TWG meeting*
- *Retailers to provide feedback at next TWG meeting on how they currently handle multiple SMC's received that have the same effective date but different energized indicators*

**Direct Energy:** Direct Energy would process all of them using the time stamp as received.

**EPCOR Energy:** Our systems are set up to receive multiple SMC transactions in one day.

**ENMAX Energy:** For ENMAX Encompass the SMC is not something we really use, so this issue doesn't impact us at this time. We derive the status of the site based on ENC and DEC today.

- *Distributors to provide feedback at next TWG meeting on how they handle SMC's for multiple events for a site that occur on the same date.*

**Fortis Alberta:** SMC's for multiple events for a site that occur on the same date are produced every time there is a change in the status for that site. The system does not produce only one SMC at the end of the day if the site has gone through multiple changes. There is no gathering of SMC triggers. Once the trigger happens we produce the SMC for that change.

**ATCO Electric:** If the state of the site is the same when we run batch processes after midnight, no SMC would be issued.

**EPCOR Distribution:** SMC is issued once daily. The trigger to issue SMC is to compare site characteristics changes; i.e. meter type and energize status changes, to previous day. If multiple events happened but the status remained the same comparing to previous day, no SMC is issued.

**Alta Gas:** SMC's are scheduled to be generated on a daily basis. If multiple events occur, the last event is reported.

**ENMAX Power:** EPC produces a SMC for every change in socket status regardless if the end of day socket status was the same. If the site is de-energized and re-energized on the same date, the retailer will receive two SMC's. Each SMC has its own time stamp to identify which action occurred first.

- *Distributors to advise if they use dates or priority codes to determine when field crews are dispatched to a site.*

**Fortis Alberta:** Where both priority code and date fields are available in the same transaction Fortis uses the priority field. We recognize Priority 1 and Priority 2 as emergency and 24 hour reconnects, all other priority values are treated as a priority 5 which is our standard 3 day SLA.

**ATCO Electric:** We use dates only.

**EPCOR Distribution:** Our system uses date when field crews are dispatched to a site. If an energize request is received which containing priority code "1" but without a request date, then the service request is issued to the field as emergency request with the priority code "1" converted to today's date.

**Alta Gas:** Priority codes are not used to determine when field crews are dispatched to a site.

**ENMAX Power:** EPC uses requested dates only. If we receive a request with a priority code only, the service request will be actioned as soon as a crew is available.

- *All members to advise if standardization was to occur, how they like the standardization would be. Would they prefer priority code or request date? If Priority code is preferred how many priority codes should there be?*

**Fortis Alberta:** If processing rules of priority codes are clearly defined then Fortis preference is to use priority codes over date stamp. The use of date allows some participants to use today's date for transactions that otherwise should be processed the day after the receipt. In those cases it is not clear if the transaction should be treated as urgent or it was a question of error.

**ATCO Electric:** We prefer a date. If priority codes were used, we would like 2 codes; 1 for standard service and 1 for priority. Currently, priorities are handled via phone calls.

**EPCOR Distribution:** Since EDTI has already used priority code "6" for new home builders, we would prefer a combination of priority codes and request date of which using request date to replace the use of priority codes 1 - 5.

**Alta Gas:** Requested date would be preferred as this is how AUI schedules work. The schedule date must conform to our Terms and Conditions

**ENMAX Power:** EPC's preference is to use request dates only. EPC is not in favor of priority codes; EPC is concerned that even if a few priority codes are provided retailers will be inclined to use priority code 1 for all requests.

**ENMAX Energy:** ENMAX Encompass would prefer using requested dates over priority codes. It is much easier to use the requested date field and then the only training (which is already being done today) is to warn customers they may incur a higher charge if the request is treated as an emergency by the WSP.

- *Distributors to provide details on how they action off cycle meter read requests. How many attempts are made to get the off cycle reading before the service request is failed? How quickly to they action off cycle read requests? Are off cycle read requests held if the requested date is days or weeks into the future? Is a fee applied if a off cycle read attempt was not successful*

**Fortis Alberta:** One. If there is no access to a property or another reason we cannot obtain the read, then we provide the retailer with an ROC transaction that indicates the reason we could not obtain the read. As per the code, ROR requests are completed within 5 business days. We don't have records of requests to be processed days or weeks in the future. We do not currently have a mechanism in place to deal with this type of request. No, a fee is only applied to the customer when the off cycle read shows the disputed meter read to be accurate.

**ATCO Electric:** Off cycle read requests are rare for us. For example, we received only 2 in November. Our AMR system attempts AMR reads on enrollments and CSAs and rate changes. No fee is applied to failed read attempts. For AMR off cycle reads, the system will make several attempts up to the normal read cycle. For manually read meters, there is no standard in place for how many attempts are made and when we fail them back. Since off cycle reads for manually read meters are so rare, we have ad-hoc processes for each division. Standard service for a manually obtained read is 2 to 5 business days. For AMR off cycle reads, it is normally 1 day.

**EPCOR Distribution:** EDTI has a 3 attempts practice on Off-Cycle Meter Reading Requests before it is failed. The first attempt starting on the service requested day, the second attempt is done on day 3 and the third attempt is done on day 5. These are business days only. EDTI accepts all service requests submitted by retailers 5 business days in advance. Fees only applied on successful attempt on all service requests (ENC and ROC).

**Alta Gas:** Off cycle read requests are also rare for AUI. However, AUI will follow standard read request procedures through service orders to obtain an off cycle read. Field staff is only dispatched once per request. A fee is applied if an off cycle read attempt is successful or not successful

**ENMAX Power:** EPC will make a minimum of three attempts within 5 business days to obtain the off-cycle meter reading. If we are unsuccessful after the first attempt, we will attempt to contact the customer via phone call to arrange a date and time to read the meter. The ROR is failed after 5 business days if we are unsuccessful in obtaining the meter reading. EPC will make the first attempt to obtain the off cycle meter reading on the date requested. EPC will hold onto the ROR request and will not make the first attempt to read the meter until the day of the requested date. EPC will assess a fee of \$16.86 once the first off cycle meter reading attempt is made. If the retailer asks that the off cycle read request be cancelled before the first attempt is made, no fee is applied.

#### 4. Site Metering Characteristics Action Item Discussion

- Three distributors send an SMC for every SMC trigger event regardless of how many times a day a site socket status changes.

- Two distributors will not send an SMC if the end of day socket's status is the same as the beginning of day socket status.
- EPCOR Distribution provided a brief historical background of the SMC, they noted that the main purpose of the SMC was to provide retailers with a starting meter reading when a site switch occurred.
- EPCOR Distribution further noted that since the Tariff Bill Code went live retailers have less reliance on the SMC as the TBF file provides meter readings for all site switches and socket status changes
- Retailers acknowledged that their systems currently handle how every distributor currently processes SMC transactions.
- The working group agreed that since there were no issues with how each distributor handles SMC processing there was no need to make any changes.
- ENMAX Power noted that AESO compliance monitoring would deem a distributor non-compliant with SMC processing rules since rule 9.6.5.1 (1) (b) (ii) requires a distributor to send an SMC for all changes to a sites energized state
- EPCOR Distribution confirmed they have received a letter of non-compliance from the AESO regarding this scenario
- The group agreed that a footnote would be added to rule 9.6.5.1 (1) (b) (ii) stating that a distributor is not required to send an SMC transaction if the sites end of day energized state was the same as the beginning of day energized state.

## **5. Priority Code Action Item Discussion**

- Two of the five distributors favored date only over a priority code when requesting ENR and DER transactions
- Two distributors favored priority codes over dates if priority code processing rules were clearly defined
- One distributor preferred a combination of dates and priority codes
- Two of the three retailers favored priority codes over request dates
- ATCO Gas noted that priority codes don't work for them as they must speak to the customer to arrange for access to the gas meter. The majority of ATCO Gas customers have their gas meters inside their premises
- ENMAX Power noted that they preferred requested dates over priority codes as dates provide a clear timeframe when to re-energize a site or de-energize a site.
- Direct Energy noted that request dates are fine for a de-energize request as there isn't an urgency to disconnect a customer as there is to reconnect a customer
- Direct Energy further stated they felt retailers should not have to incur additional costs to call a distributor to request an urgent reconnect when Rule 021 already has a priority code for urgent reconnects
- ENMAX Power noted that the majority of reconnect requests received are completed within 24 hours and as such did not have an urgent reconnect process
- ATCO Electric asked if 24 hours what a reasonable time frame is for reconnects.
- Direct Energy stated that 10% of reconnects are emergency or urgent and 90% are standard reconnects.
- Direct Energy asked if it made sense to have standardization for the 90% and handle the 10% as exceptions.
- ATCO Electric stated that since this was a performance based issue, should this issue not be agreed upon in Rule 002 before it can be added to Rule 021?

- ENMAX Energy noted that Rule 002 reports on performance measures, before reporting could be done a performance standard must be agreed upon first.
- ATCO Gas and ATCO Electric stated that they are not structured to respond to priority codes. If priority codes are implemented they would need to include these in their next rate filing due to increased costs
- ATCO Gas felt that the TWG could not decide how priority codes would work for gas distributors simply because of the nature of their customers and the fact they need access to a customer's premise to inspect that all gas appliances are running properly after the gas service has been reconnected.
- ATCO Gas felt that priority codes could work for Electric Distributors and the current process they have for their customers should remain the same.
- ATCO Electric asked if Fortis could reconnect a customer within 24 hours.
- Fortis replied that they do have satellite offices throughout Alberta and could possibly reconnect a site within 24 hours but they needed to confirm if this was possible.
- Electric Distributors were asked if they could reconnect a site within 24 hours

**Action Item:** Electric Distributors to confirm if they could reconnect the majority of their sites within 24 hours.

## 6. Off Cycle Meter Reading Action Item Discussion

- The working group noted that each distributor handles off cycle meter read requests in a similar manner
- Retailers stated that they do not have any issues with how distributors handle off cycle meter readings
- The working group agreed that there was a common level of standardization between distributors and no further action was required

## 7. Transaction Content Review

- Fortis stated they had a couple of changes to previously reviewed transactions that they would like to have changed
- Fortis asked that in the WSI transaction, field element # 8 be a conditional field as opposed to a mandatory field
- Fortis stated they only populate the WSP ID when sending the WSI to a REA, Fortis felt that element #8 should only be populated in this instance.
- EPC stated they always populate element #8
- The working group agreed to amend WSI sequence #8 to conditional. The condition being that the LSA populates element #8 if it is available in their system
- Fortis asked that in the WSD transaction, field element # 13 be a conditional field as opposed to a mandatory field
- Fortis stated they leave element #13 null when a site has interval meter reads.
- The working group agreed to amend WSD element sequence #13 to a conditional field, the condition being element 13 is null, mandatory if site in non-interval
- Fortis asked that in the WSD transaction, field element # 15 be an optional field as opposed to a mandatory field
- Fortis stated they leave this field null

- The working group agreed to amend WSD element sequence #15 to an optional field
- Fortis asked that in the DEF transaction, field element # 8 be an optional field as opposed to a mandatory field
- Fortis stated they felt this should be an optional field as transaction status codes are now descriptive enough that failure comments were not necessary
- ENMAX Power and Direct Energy both stated that failure comments would still be required for the different safety codes. The comments would explain to a retailer what the safety issue was
- The group agreed to amend DEF element sequence #8 to a conditional field. The condition is that a distributor must provide the comment if it is available in their system
- The group then began to review the UCI transaction, the group got as far as sequence 64 before time ran out.
- The group agree the following sequences were mandatory 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6
- The following sequences were conditional; 7 through 9, 13 through 49, 53, 55 through 57 and 59 through 64
- The following sequences were optional; 10 through 12, 50, 51, 52 and 58
- Before the meeting adjourned Fortis asked if there was an opportunity to create new transactions to replace spreadsheets used between WSP's and REA's
- The AUC advised that Fortis should log that as an issue in the RIM system

**8. Decision made at this meeting**

- Agreement that off cycle read requests were standardized enough among distributors. No change is required.

**9. Recap of the Action Items:**

- ATCO Electric to provide a framework for the PFAM summary report
- Electric Distributors to confirm if they could reconnect the majority of their sites within 24 hours.

**10. Next Meeting**

- Next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, 10:00 to 14:00, February 10, 2011 at ENMAX Place in Calgary

Address of the meeting is listed as follows:

***ENMAX Place  
141 50 Ave SE  
Calgary Alberta T2G 4S7  
Southland Meeting Room***

AUC will send out an agenda later.