



Issues not resolved by June 30 will not make Jan 2010 version.

Issue → revised code → comment from different entities →

AESO: will there be delay from Jan 2010 if revised code has problems? AUC: No, these changes would be taken out rather than delay issue of new code.

## 2. MDM Reporting Standards presented by AESO

Group consensus: Straight to discussion of document

AESO has found MDM reporting is inconsistent. Need for agreement on what it is that MDMs should be reporting

AUC sees this a broader compliance issue. Need consistency so everyone knows what is non-compliant.

Review Topic by Topic

### REPORT TIMING

Change to the submission on the 13<sup>th</sup> business day.

Question raised: why is the MDM in charge of self-reporting. Is this a role for the auditor (AUC/AESO)?

Discussion: 5 years ago, stakeholders liked the idea of self reporting. Part of the intent was to get a general sense of the market. Now there is a single entity with authority and oversight of market (Still, they may not have all the information AESO does not access to raw data). There is an issue with trying to fit something that is not load settlement related into the load settlement time table. The AESO can only base the reporting from the DSM level.

An issue is that there are often more than one measurement for a DSM transaction. The AESO does not have this granularity of information.

### INTERVAL

Estimated energy vs. Estimated intervals.

Estimated energy is more accurate.

### CUMULATIVE LEVEL

How do you count the number of meter an MDM is accountable for?

There are differences in how this number is calculated: major inconsistencies.

AUC: what is done with these reports, what is the value from the report?

AESO: it is fair to hold people to reasonable performance standards.

Can we place a descriptive and definitive report that reports the essentials rather than a broad report.

A common interpretation of the intent of the report is needed. Re-analysis of report: what/how many do we need? Who will conduct?

In the meantime: should we stop running the reports.

Which eight reports make sense? Are a useful metric in determining how well an MDM is reporting?

**NEW ISSUE (#142) which of the eight issues do we need to keep?**

**AUC will develop a new reporting system. AESO requests that the new system be much more proscriptive. By the end of March 2009.**

EPCOR: can there be a published standard to compare market MDM's. Before this we need to solve universal standards.

AE: The driver behind the metrics should be what the AUC want so see performed. IF there is no criteria, then there is not reason behind the metrics.

Action question: what should be done with reports now (in regards to 12<sup>th</sup> business day report)? AUC: leave as status quo until changes are made.

3. Review of 2009 SSC WG Issues

Remaining items left on the 2009 SSC WG Issues (Issues #94-141)

These numbers will remain the same no matter what group/bin they are sent to.

**Issue #98 Deemed time:**

If we cannot standardize deemed time (issue is too large). Can we have distributors clarify their deemed time processes? Examples please. DE to create 5 scenarios for examples. Distributors will then set up clear explanations.

First Step: Who is doing what. AUC needs to know.

Disclosure now. Solution will work in conjunction with AMI.

4. Update – Supplementary Tables Subgroup chaired by Angela Corsi

- Discussion

- Member review:

Significant proposal made. Draft proposal circulated amongst members of SG.

Review of tables were made. Supplementary table section proposed → change process is easier.  
Identified

see Supp table Meeting summary.

PFEC and PFAM “tables” are really forms. They should be labeled as such and removed. Some tables are also actually examples.

*3 main things??*

Inconsistencies in the transaction table labels. Creation of a “settlement table” with letters (refer to reference table).

Table 51 was discussed, different format will be proposed. A different layout. Right now it is 21 pages.

Proposal for next meeting. Intent is to not change code, just simplify presentation.

The timing table is outside the scope of this SG

**\*overnight will need to be defined by definitions group Issue # 144**

## 5. Update – Retailer Deselect Subgroup chaired by Brian Neufeld

- Discussion

Meeting on Feb 13, mainly retailers (one distributor)

See presentation.

Need consistency.

7 days proposal.

Gas ties into this discussion because some retailers do gas and electric.

SRR timing should be “same timing as when another retailer enrolls the site”

Proposal another return status code on SRN...

Modifying the SRR will be an issue because everyone will need to change transaction process. There will be a built in to detect a DSR that needs to be cancelled/ignored because another retailer has enrolled the site.

This way may be easier to implement than creating a new transaction. However, a new transaction may make it simpler. It can be submitted at any time within the allotted time period.

The SG can suggest a layout for a new revoke transaction.

AESO: This will be a challenging change.

The idea is to be able to re-enroll the site without losing it.

Approach may be to build a process and create/change transaction to accommodate.

Perhaps have a status code on DSR to signal as a flag. Manual flagging by email is not acceptable for AESO process.

A convoluted signal is not a good long-term investment. There is a need for something to be clean enough to be measurable in the future. The AUC does not want band-aid solution. Code changes are long-term investments.

Proposal: a new transaction. SG will hold meeting to design.

7 day issue.

Wire owners will have to deal with the outcomes of a shortened timeline. Note: There are no customer rep at the meeting. Is this a reasonable timeline in every case? Customer may not say so.

Customer will automatically go to default supply. 7 calendar days could possibly mean only 3 business days.

Action questions: how do we deal with the issue? New transaction. Is consistency necessary? Yes, this is a primary function of the market.

Increasing the time to 15 days would drive up cost and risk for non-regulated providers. This could be a barrier to the market. Significant bad debt.

What is to be done with customer notification for drops? There is reference in regulation. Problems occur when people get dropped without notification.

What counts as notification? A bill? Needs name of default supplier as well as terms and condition.

Competitive retailers cannot collect bad debts through GRA/ wires owners.

AUC will discuss timeline issue.

Retailers want a new transaction to revoke, consistent time line 7days – 60 days.

Some notification of customer is a good thing.

Proposal to “other transaction” to erroneous enrollment transaction (see error code 003).

## **6. Update – Definitions Subgroup chaired by Nancy Cameron**

- Discussion

Definitions can result in major work and the SG recognizes that it has impact on systems.

Presentation will be brought up roughly around end of May.

## **7. Wrap-up**

Future meetings (next 4)

AUC will continue to host but will represent in Edmonton.

Last Wednesday each month. 10:00-2:00

Mar25

Apr29

May27

June24