

**AUC Rule 021: Settlement Systems Code
2009 SSC Working Group
Meeting Summary**

Meeting Date April 28, 2009 **Time** 10:00 to 14:00
Location Alberta Utilities Commission **Facilitator** AUC Staff

Calgary Office
 Fifth Avenue Place, 4th Floor
 425-1st Street SW
 Room 439 – Video Conference
 Room

Edmonton Office:
 10055 - 106 Street, 10th Floor
 Room 1034 – Video Conference
 Room

| Name | Organization |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Rob Thomas | AUC |
| Will Chow | AUC |
| Kirsty McDougall | AESO |
| Nancy Cameron | AESO |
| Bruce Ramsay | ATCO Electric |
| Nap Pepin | ATCO Electric |
| Jennifer Bell | ATCO Gas |
| Anne Glass | Direct Energy |
| Leslie Howell | Energy Savings Group |
| Brian Neufeld | ENMAX Energy/Encompass |
| Paul Lindsay | ENMAX Power |
| Lorne McKay | ENMAX Power |
| Lisa Lamers-Zuger | EPCOR Distribution and Transmission |
| Shun Fung | EPCOR Distribution and Transmission |
| Joel Milne-Epp | EPCOR Energy Services |
| John Hutchison | Valeo Power |
| David Lenz | Valeo Power |
| Angela Corsi | Fortis Alberta |
| David Jackman | Fortis Alberta |
| Marie Gallant | Encana |
| Donna Sanderow | Encana |
| Lori Harnack | Cognera |
| Darel Davies | UtilityNet |
| Randy Clark | Midas Metering |
| Rick Cowburn | UCA |

Supplementary Tables Sub-Group

NP – The supplier of last resort is no longer in use

NC – So Default Retailer (DE) would be the same as the Supplier of Last Resort (LR)

RC – LR doesn't exist legally anymore

CHANGE – remove LR

EDIT – Remove “I” from Load Settlement Agent ID title

Discussion regarding difficulties of determining definition of LSA, to be raised in Definitions discussions

NC – Has added a note to double check the dates on LSA ID Table

AC – Definitions to specify who responsible party is

RC – Need to take into account a need to specify the person responsible at law and the person responsible in practical terms

CHANGE – Zone 1002 for Epcor should be added into Settlement Zone ID Table

CHANGE – Add GIM to DIM Status Flag Codes

Discussion regarding difficulty in defining business day (what constitutes banking holidays etc, same thing as settlement days?)

ACTION – AUC to post defined business days calendar (define banking holidays)

AG – Question regarding transaction 9 and use of specific codes

AC – Optional to use codes, stated in Rule already

RC – Requirement to notify AUC anyway

SF – Question regarding CSE, will it be removed? Not discussed, only discussion of SSR and SIR?

RT - ATCO raised the CSE, the group concurred and the AUC stated it would be removed effective Jan. 1st

Transactions Sub-Group

KM – When publishing new site ID catalogue through drop-shoot, it should also be sent to AESO

Suggestion to send this to retailers as well, currently posted on websites

PL – Previous complaints about large files on dropshoot, and so current practice of website posting used

NC – Could specify a time (ie: noon on a Friday) for updates

SF – Updates currently done daily

NC – This is not consistent with every wire owner, code only specifies weekly

ACTION ITEM – This issue will be flagged for further discussion (how data will be provided – website, dropshoot, email)

RT – Regarding issue 62, suggests that to the contrary, electronic format should be mandated consistently

KM – ROR, ROC, RDR would then also need to be modified

AG – Issues: whether distributor is required to accept transaction and whether it is required to complete the transaction.

Would want the ability to immediately stop the process even if the transaction has been sent.

PL – Must be able to make a phone call. Can't rely on dropshoot

SF – If there is an outstanding energize, the revoke de-energize request will be done, but if its already been done, the request will be rejected

ATCO Electric, Enmax – Not sure if the RDR is processed

ACTION – ATCO and Enmax to provide comments

RT – Would suggest leave transaction and require dropshoot transmittal

AC – Should specify Issue 128 – Wire owner rather than MDM, since the latter has nothing to do with enrolment

RT – To clarify, this is not an erroneous enrolment, it is a correct enrolment with an erroneous site ID

ACTION – Feedback needed on impact of adding USA transactions

ACTION – Group to be formed to re-design UCI transaction, longer timeline than current review of SSC

KM – Should have a legal review for privacy issues re: Issue 133

ACTION – Not a problem for AUC under FOIP, but market participants should verify and provide comment re: Issue 133/privacy.

EDTI – Did not find tariff rate code would be a problem, but the energized indicator would be contrary to PIPA and creates privacy issues

KM – If this can't be published in the site catalogue, is there a way a retailer can request this information up-front, before enrolment. This causes problems again with PIPA because one is getting information for customers not yet enrolled.

CHANGE: RT – There will be no mandate to do something contrary to PIPA, so the energize indicator will no be considered but the tariff rate code will be entered into considerations. The energize indicator may be revisited in the future through different avenues

NOTE – Issue 129 recommendation assumes the energize indicator will be in place...

ACTION – Comments on subgroup proposals to be returned by next Friday, May 8th

Retailer De-Select Sub-Group

Valeo would like a courtesy period to avoid disconnect between retailer and LSA, since competitive retailers are unable to enroll a site because transactions for retailers are blocked for 24 hours if a default supplier transaction has already been received that day.

Additionally, there is no provision in the code to backdate enrollment

Issue added for the consideration of the Retailer De-Select sub-group

Definitions Sub-Group

ACTION: Issue 31 to be referred to Streetlight working group

ACTION: Issue 37 to be transferred to the eventual UCI group

ACTION: Issue 102, 118, 119 to be sent to the AUC for rule-making consideration

New Issues

New Issue – Issue 147:

KM – Have found instances where an energize request is sent out by a retailer and in the time that this takes to be done, another retailer enrolls the site, so should the energize complete go to the person who now owns the site or would it go back to the person who requested it.

BN – Also, who gets billed for the energize request

KM – And if it goes back to the requester, how does the new retailer get the information. It happens both ways, so there is a need to be consistent

Issue 146

RT – Review of action item raised at previous meeting regarding processes for meter tests, each wires company will send in a description of the current procedure.

New Issue – Issue 148:

AG – Raised issue of emergency energizations

ACTION ITEM: Participants to forward process (contact etc) to obtain an emergency energization which retailers must follow

ACTION ITEM: Participants to review all working group recommendations for comments

ACTION ITEM: Participants to review updated issue list to ensure that further action is not required for their part

ACTION ITEM: AUC to provide updates on PFAM and PFEC processes next meeting, flowcharts will be provided in advance

Next meeting May 26th