



## 2 Transaction Subgroup Update

- The Transaction Subgroup has begun the process of reviewing each field in each transaction in Rule 021, determining whether it is mandatory, conditional or optional and, when conditional, what conditions lead to populating the field in what way. The subgroup began the progress by defining the terms mandatory, conditional and optional. The definitions they came up with are very close to those in the Tariff Billing Code (Rule 004). The subgroup also recommended removing the Site Cumulative Update (SCU) transaction since it is not used in the industry.
- The group will meet next on October 28, to continue reviewing the fields of each transaction.

## 3 DropChute Replacement Subgroup Update

- A draft RFI was sent to the DropChute Replacement Subgroup members, and AUC is waiting comments by the end of the week.
- Upon receiving the comments, the RFI will be sent next week to 10 vendors in Canada and the U.S.

## 4 AUC Rule 021 (Version 2.1) – Draft

- Before reviewing the second draft of the proposed changes to Rule 021, AUC explained that the proposed changes would be posted on the AUC website by Friday, October 1<sup>st</sup>. A bulletin announcing the proposed changes and the process for providing comment would be issued to market then as well. The proposed changes will be the clean version of the document that the SSC Working Group members had received earlier that week. A redline version of Rule 021 would not be posted, but proposed changes would be highlighted in yellow.
- Last meeting, the AUC had agreed to change “kWh” to “usage” or “consumption.” AUC explained that they would not be making this change, because PFAMs can be used to adjust UFE and losses (i.e. more than just usage or consumption) but not kVARs. For, example, if a transmission-connected site was charged UFE and losses when it should not have been, PFAM would be appropriate, but if kVARs on DIM transactions were incorrect, PFAM would not be appropriate. Therefore, “kWh” represents specifically what should be adjusted through PFAM.
- The point was raised that, for the automated process of searching for changes to data affecting periods already final settled, it had been decided in the subgroup meetings that the LSA need only search for changes to usage (not UFE or losses) and those changes would need to be more than  $\pm 100$  kWh for the usage portion only. AUC agreed to make the change from “kWh” to “usage” or “consumption,” but only for PFAMs resulting from the automated processes performed by the LSA. So, if any party identifies an error that impacts UFE or losses, they can PFAM it provided the total error exceeds  $\pm 100$  kWh, but the LSA is not expected or required to build automated processes to identify those errors. AUC did state, however, that any changes agreed to in this meeting would not be made to the version what would be posted on the AUC website for comment; rather those changes would appear in the final version.

**Action:** AUC will change the materiality test for the section dealing with site-level errors identified by the LSA (subsection 5.3.3(1)) to clarify that the LSA need only monitor its settlement system for changes to usage and will apply the materiality test on the usage only. A statement will be added to the effect that if errors are identified by the LSA outside of its monitoring process, the materiality limit will apply to all kWh.

- Discussion about PFAMs and missed meter reads. The point was raised that there should be a statement that PFAMs should not be submitted for sites that have not had a meter reading by final settlement, much like there is a statement for PFECs saying, “The lack of a

meter read shall not be the basis for a PFEC application.” It was emphasized that it is the MDM’s, not the LSA’s, responsibility to obtain meter reads and, if the LSA does not have the reads, it cannot produce a PFAM adjustment. There are other means to address missing meter reads (i.e. compliance to Rule 002 for the LSA and to Rule 021 for the MDM). AUC was reluctant to add this as a statement in Rule 021, expressing concern that if every detail was included in the rule, the rule would just continue to expand and grow. AUC stated it would issue a clarifying statement instead.

**Action:** Parties are encouraged to comment in the matrix provided if they feel strongly about it and consider this issue should be address in the PFAM section.

- Discussion about the materiality threshold for system-level errors. 100 kWh was felt to be too low for system-level errors (except possibly for large micro-generation).

**Action:** Parties were asked to provide comment on appropriate materiality threshold for system-level errors with their other comments.

- For subsection 5.3.1(6) it was recommended that the word “only” be removed.

**Action:** AUC will make the change.

- In subsection 5.3.3(2)(j)(ii), the suggestion was made to change the phrase “± 100 kWh or more” to “± 100 kWh or greater” to be consistent with 5.3.3(1)(b) and (3)(a).

**Action:** AUC will change the phrase “± 100 kWh or more” to “± 100 kWh or greater” in subsection 5.3.3(2)(j)(ii).

- For subsection 5.3.3(3)(a), it was pointed out that the way it is worded it implies that either DSM data is resent or GIM data but not both. In the case of large micro-generation, both would need to be resent.

**Action:** AUC will change 5.3.3(3)(a) to make it clear that, in the case of large micro-generation, both DSM and GIM data will need to be resubmitted to the various recipients.

- Discussion about the lack of clarity regarding what the RAM transaction is, how the various transactions work together and how the ISO uses the RSAs, TAAs and RAM to provide financial adjustments to the industry.

**Action:** AUC will write an opening paragraph for section 5.3.5, explaining that the RAM is a transaction that each LSA sends to the ISO monthly that shows the total zone load by retailer that was in the most recent final settlement run. The ISO uses that load by retailer to portion out the offsetting adjustments to the RSAs and TAAs. In other words, the RSAs and TAAs cause financial adjustments to flow to various retailers throughout the month. The ISO sums all of the adjustments, netting positive adjustments against negative ones, and then creates offsetting adjustments to the retailers to pay for the RSA and TAA adjustments. The ISO uses load from the most recent final settlement run as the basis for portioning out the offsetting adjustments.

- One of the parties asked if it would be possible to send the RAM transactions to retailers, as well. It was agreed that there would be no possibility due to the confidentiality issues regarding the data.
- Discussion regarding when the 8-year period starts and ends in the case of a credit adjustment. Does the LSA begin counting back from the last date that was final settled, thereby not including the period not yet final settled? Or does the LSA start from when the RSA is prepared? Or from when the error was identified? As pointed out by one of the subgroup’s members, referencing subgroup meeting notes, the agreement reached was to count back 8 years from when the RSA gets produced.

- Regarding section 5.3.5, the question was raised about the need for a consolidated monthly RSA file to the ISO, or is the AESO fine with daily consolidated files and can the requirement be removed from Rule 021.

**Action:** AESO to confirm whether or its processes require/depend upon a monthly consolidated RSA.

- Also in 5.3.5, subsection (1)(a)(v) talks about “Direct Connect customers” and references subsection 4.2.1(2). The point was made that a definition of Direct Connect customers is needed. It was suggested that 4.2.1(2) be changed to read, “Despite subsection (1) above, Direct Connect Sites, as defined below, will not be allocated UFE effective...” AUC agreed to the change.

**Action:** AUC will change subsection 4.2.1(2) to read, “Despite subsection (1) above, Direct Connect Sites, as defined below, will not be allocated UFE effective...”

- One party raised the question of whether or not PFEC and PFAM forms for small micro-generation sites should go to the MDM to request revised GCMs rather than to the LSA. Others agreed that this is not the time to be redesigning the small micro-generation process.
- Discussion around section 5.3.8 and value to the retailers. Retailers need information about the PFAMs to answer customer questions.
- One party pointed out that, in the tables in Appendix A, references to the MDM mistakenly say “MDMA”.

**Action:** AUC will replace references to “MDMA” with “MDM” for tables from Appendix A.

- Errors in numbering sections in the proposed document were identified, making it difficult to cross reference sections to their references elsewhere in the rule. For example, the heading for the RSA transaction in 9.6.6 should be numbered 9.6.6.1, not 9.6.6.3.

**Action:** AUC will correct the numbering and verify the cross-references.

## 5 Settlement Timing Implementation – AUC Draft Proposed Timeline

- AUC presented a draft proposal for transitioning from the old settlement timelines to the new. The AUC proposal involved skipping 4 interim settlement runs and moving straight to final for those months. This would cause problems for some. Some parties suggested that it would be preferable to run multiple settlement runs a month to get caught up.

**Action:** Parties to investigate and see if their systems permit running multiple settlement runs in a month and to provide details on the negative impacts this might bring. Additional proposals can be submitted, as well. The responses should be provided by October 15, 2010.

- AUC asked permission from ENMAX and EPCOR to distribute to the group their proposals, as well. The two parties agreed.

**Action:** AUC will circulate their proposals to the group members and ask the group to identify their preferred option(s).

## 6 TBF Appendices

- AUC informed the group that one of the distributors had identified that its data in appendices of Rule 004 (Tariff Billing Code) requires revision. AUC will request approval to modify to rule and is planning to remove the appendices containing company-specific information from the rule to the AUC website. AUC would prefer to update everyone’s company-specific information at the same time.

**Action:** By the next meeting, parties are to check their company-specific information contained in the Rule 004 appendices and notify AUC if the information needs to be changed.

## 7 Other Issues

- ENMAX Power indicated that it might not be able to implement the changes by July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. It will come with a certain answer as soon as it has more information.

**Action:** Other parties should check as well and provide a date when they could implement the changes, but AUC will push for the July 1<sup>st</sup> date.

- AUC announced that Lori Harnack of Cogenera volunteered to chair the Enrollments and Energization subgroup.
- AUC notified the group that the Cut Off for Non-Payments subgroup is at a stage where it is seeking permission from the Executive Advisory Committee to start consultation.

## 8 Next Meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled for October 27, 2010.