

1. Post-Redline version of Rule 021

AUC – Agenda amendment: discussion around de-select timing to be fit in.

AUC – Formal comment will be allowed at the end of the process. This is a meeting to discuss major issues. PFAM changes are reflected in this version. The bulk of concerns revolved around this issue. The Commission has indicated that they would like to see the SSC transition to a Rule +Settlement Manual model. Clarifying the manual will be much easier than a rule change.

Fortis – There is a lack of process (detailed) for USA transaction. The committee and AUC should consider adding a trigger to update the site ID catalogue. Two approaches were taken for applying the new transactions. USA is quite different than DSR. IT developers need to understand triggers for these transactions. Rules need to be built around when the transactions are used. Clarification is required from USA.

ENMAX Energy – Retailers would like to see an update of the USA whenever a change has happen in any of the fields.

AUC – USA and UCI transactions are in inherently different. The two perform different function. Clarification can happen around this issue.

Group consensus on revisiting the wording around USA.

Fortis – Regarding status codes (energize fail code); where would they be?

EPCOR – WSP would put in additional code that is company specific.

AESO – there would be no defined company specific reason codes.

EPCOR – Adding/changing reason codes need easier.

AUC – Dealing with this issue can be a part of the work of the 2010 SSC WG. Specifically, reason codes can be a matter to be dealt with in a Settlement Manual

AE – De-select process is the major point of discussion. Minor flaw – a flaw in the reason a code exists. This will be distributed over email.

The issue refers to revoking a De-select late. The default retailer has already prepared their enrollment. Can a deadline be put in place?

EPCOR – if a site has been De-selected, the enrolment to default retailer is issued. The transaction is held until midnight.

AUC – The requirements regarding the enrolment priorities is set out in the Regulation. The SSC will follow this.

AE – upon receiving a de-select, a potential enrollment is sent to default. If no revoke is sent in then all goes through. If a revoke is sent in, then the default needs some time to cancel their enrollment.

AUC – what if no revoke is sent in but another enrollment from a comp retailer?

AE – revoke de-select should have deadline of two days.

EPCOR – Competitive retailers should have precedent up until the very last minute.

AUC – with default enrollment, the end result needs to be the same. And this result needs to comply with the Regulation.

Fortis – Result oriented rule would be fine with the exception of the FORTIS and EDTI shared zone.

AUC – if the group wishes for the commission to step in, then standardization will be implemented. Regulation is clear about end result specifications. A Revoke De-select deadline before the one set in the Regulation is not possible.

EDTI – Regarding wording of enrollment reporting timelines; if the default enrollment is held and then back-dated, this is not compliant.

AUC – default enrollment is not a true enrollment and is not included in this reporting.

ENMAX – had minor changes highlighted in their written response.

AUC – AUC will respond to these minor issues via email and telephone.

ENMAX – has an issue around the metering metrics reporting.

AUC – these are under discussion. A resolution (outside of the group) is being handled. The resolution will be brought up and discussed with the other distributors

ENMAX – comment around MicroGen. Changing update to be “approved rather than commissioned”

AE – it is the obligation of the MG owner to notify the retailer. It is up to the retailer to ask the question to ascertain whether or not they want the site.

AUC – this issue can be raised as a part of the 2010 SSC WG

ENMAX – information exchange standards (section 9.6). If one portion of the site is estimated, then the whole thing is estimated.

9.6.1.1 should be a GIM not DIM.

Real metering point definition needs to be revisited. Compare to AESO.

AUC – definitions will be worked to flow through from all Acts and Regulations. This specific issue can be raised in the 2010 SSC WG.

AE – code 0202 of table A-9. “Already de-selected” should be moved up to the general transactions status code table (the one above).

EPCOR – If a DSR is received with less than 10 days, then it will automatically moved to 10 days. Error code will be de-select notification too short.

Will the AUC allow retro active transactions? I.e. CSE

AUC – this may be a part of implementation dates and transition discussions.

Cognera – process on Section 7.9, installation of load limiter. Who is making the decision to install?

AUC – the distributor decides if it is allowed.

Cognera – LSA table in the supplementary table. This seems to be a mix of different concepts. For example, why is Crowsnest Pass still in there? There is a need for conceptual consistency. The table didn't really add clarity

AUC – the expiry date to keep this update. This is to convey contact information at certain times.

Valeo – Would it make the Supplementary Tables clearer to add the LSA to the Zone table?

AUC – to add consistency with the TBC, DCM and GCM multiplier should be changed to (14,9) from the subgroup recommendation of (7,2)

2. Implementation Dates of the SSC Version 2.0

AUC – The rule will go into affect January 1, 2010. Are there any implementation dates that need to be delayed? Which items will not be able to meet Jan1?

AE – Q2 earliest for a full implementation

Joe – AUI is waiting for SSC implementation in order to implement their changes on the gas side.

Retailers indicated that they wish to perform testing all at one time.

Fortis could be ready for April 1

ENMAX Power – Q2

EPCOR – April 1

AUC – please notify the AUC of preferred time line and reasons by **Wednesday September 23, 2009**.

Cognera – is the meter multiplier the only issue that AUI is concerned about?

AUC – three transactions impact AUI: DCM, SMC, Site Catalogue.

Fortis – how is a discrepancy between implementation date and effective date handled

Joe – TBC had it spelled out. This could be used as an example.

Retailers will get back to their IT groups to consult on whether or not Phase-in or all in approach will be better.

AUC – market testing with retailers will happen. A big bang approach would be ideal.

3. Remaining Issues on the 2009 SSC Issues List

AUC – TIM will be implemented for 2010 SSC WG.

The commission has been made aware of the process for changing the SSC for following years.

New issues from this point on will be cycled into the 2010 SSC WG.

4. Starting the Special Task Forces

- Dropchute

Fortis – will IT reps from organization be required to attend?

AUC – Ideally, a representative from the IT group will work with a representative from this group. It may not be the case that both reps from an organization be required to attend every meeting.

Valeo – what will be the scope of the project?

AUC – figure out what the problems are, possible solutions, costs.

- Roles and Responsibilities

AUC – this is not necessarily a working group project. The AUC will need to consult legal as well as DOE work out a solution.

- Section 12 of the SSC

AUC – compliance section will be rewritten. Changes have to do with the structure of the commission: what the AUC can and cannot do. What do to once non-compliance is established? Discussions will happen between AUC, AESO and possibly MSA.

A draft will be created with AESO and be available for comment.

Fortis – what is the timing?

AUC – implementation of new section 12 will be in 2011.

Final issues:

AUC – bringing back the UCI working group? This will be added into the 2010 issues list. Cognera and ENMAX Energy have voiced interest in shortening the UCI.

ENMAX Power – What is the status of PFAM?

AUC – last PFAM meeting should be reflected in the newest version.

ENMAX Power – the issues brought up in the latest meeting was be not what to do with PFAM's but what causes PFAM's.

AUC – this will be a part of 2010 issues. For now the AUC will be monitoring PFAM statistics from AESO.

Fortis – relating to PFAM's. Was there any thought to bringing PFEC's back to original state?

AUC – the PFEC changes will stay in place.

PFAM changes will have to change some internal communications.

Retailers are expected to submit their PFEC's with email?

AUC – set a date for the first meeting of the 2010 SSC WG: October 13, 2009.