

Transactions Subgroup – April 17, 2009

Anne Glass, Direct Energy
 Brian Neufeld, Enmax Encompass
 David Jackman, FortisAlberta
 Kenh Tran, ATCO Electric
 Kirsty McDougall, AESO
 Lisa Lamers-Zuger, Epcor
 Nap Pepin, ATCO Electric
 Paul Lindsay, Enmax Power
 Raymond Lee, AUC
 Shun Fung, Epcor
 Will Chow, AUC

Absent

Leslie Howell, AESC
 James Mancini, AUC

Items Discussed

1. Plan is to present recommendations to the SWG for all issues at the SWG meeting scheduled for April 28 (issue 122 already referred on March 31).
2. Issue 122 was presented at the SWG meeting on March 31 for discussion. The group requested written detail on the issue and this has been forwarded to the AUC for circulation prior to next meeting.
3. All open issues from the last meeting were discussed further during the meeting – see Issues List below for details.
4. Status at end of meeting: 17 issues in total with decisions made on all 17 (recommend action on 12, declined to pursue 5).
5. There will be no further meetings of the Transactions subgroup unless further issues arise from the presentation to the SWG.

Issues List

Note:

- Blue shading indicates action required prior to next meeting
- Grey shading indicates decision has been reached on that issue

Issue ID	46
Issue as identified	Review need for cancel type transactions to simplify correction if erroneous transmissions
Additional information	Need a method to correct transactions that have been transmitted with incorrect content. Particular issue for ENC/ DEC and SMC. Causes confusion in the market.
Discussion	Mar 4: To be discussed next meeting. Each member to review the list of transactions (excluding PFAM and settlement transactions) and determine which need a cancellation process. List of transactions with

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	<p>brief explanation to be submitted to Kirsty McD by Friday, Mar 20.</p> <p>Mar 30: Transactions identified as possibly needing cancellations are ENC, DEC, SMC & GRN (typically because of typos made during creation) and ROR (typically because of change of planned move-in and move-out dates and fee associated with off cycle reads). Discussed the necessity of back dating transactions in these cases and whether a process or transaction change is more appropriate. Each member will identify the approx number of 'cancel' transactions per month and possible system impacts of transaction change prior to next meeting (info to be sent to Kirsty McD).</p> <p>Apr 17: Information gathered suggests that the issue is not as large as originally suspected. Only 1 – 2 ENC/ DEC's are cancelled per month and while there was originally thought to be 30 – 50 ROR cancels per month, this has declined significantly with the introduction of monthly meter reads. Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	No changes required to incorporate cancel transactions at this time. (Note that the deselect process was not considered here as it is being looked at by another subgroup.)

Issue ID	61
Issue as identified	Revoke De-energize Confirmation (RDC) transaction
Additional information	This transaction was removed from the SSC some time ago as it was agreed that DEC/ DEF would provide the failure/ success of the revoke. However, some references to RDC still exist in Rule 021 which causes confusion in the market.
Discussion	Mar 4: Decision made
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend removing extraneous references to RDC (in Abbreviations, Status Codes, Timing table, etc)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	62
Issue as identified	Remove Revoke De-energize (RDR) transaction
Additional information	Enmax Power request removal of this transaction as it is rarely used and it is a cost to maintain in their system.
Discussion	Mar 4: Epcor report that this transaction is used extensively by the regulated rate retailers in particular (approx. 10,000 txns per year). Transaction may not be quick enough to prevent a de-energize in an

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	emergency situation. Decision made.
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend leaving transactions in place but correcting s7.1.1.2)a)viii) to agree with Table 6 which indicates electronic submission is not required, i.e. each WSP can determine whether they use the transaction or accept phone call/ email or both
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	64
Issue as identified	Change meter multiplier data type
Additional information	The DCM transaction indicates meter multiplier should be of data type Number (6, 1). However there are meters in current use which have multipliers with more than one decimal place and so the data type needs to accommodate that.
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: This is an issue for more than one MDM and also applies to the SMC and GCM transactions. The tariff bill code allows for Number (14, 9) for meter multiplier. There could be an impact on the kWh field if the multiplier changes to more than 2 decimal places. To be discussed further at next meeting. Each member will review internally and bring their requirements to the next meeting.</p> <p>Mar 30: Agreement reached that change to 2 decimal places is appropriate (most use whole numbers anyway). Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend changing data type on DCM meter multiplier field to Number (7, 2).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	65
Issue as identified	Change precision on WSD Daily Site Usage (kWh) data type
Additional information	There are two issues around precision on WSD usage. Valeo are requesting a change in precision to match the usage total on the WSI (so that reconciliation is more exact) and Fortis need to extend the data type to allow for a small number of sites where the usage already exceeds the current Number (8, 2) format. Also applies to the Daily Site Loss kWh and Daily Site UFE kWh fields.
Discussion	Mar 4: Decision made
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend changing data type on WSD Daily Site Usage kWh, Daily Site Loss kWh and Daily Site UFE kWh fields to Number (12, 4). Also recommend changing data type on DCM kWh field to Number (12, 4)

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09


	to match the WSD.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	68
Issue as identified	Mechanism to recall/ cancel a DIM file
Additional information	Need more info from Valeo who raised this issue
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: There are potentially two issues here – cancellation of an individual transaction and cancellation/ recall of a complete transaction file. The transaction cancellation issue will be dealt with as part of Issue 46. Kirsty McD will follow up with Valeo on requirements to cancel complete file.</p> <p>Mar 30: Need to cancel individual transaction not identified as part of Issue 46 so no change required. Kirsty McD to confirm with Valeo on cancellation of complete file.</p> <p>Apr 17: Valeo have confirmed that the circumstances surrounding the ability to recall a complete file no longer exist. Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Declined to pursue 	No change required to incorporate cancel transactions at this time.

Issue ID	76
Issue as identified	Remove SSR and SIR transactions
Additional information	Because the site catalogs are now published on a regular basis there is no real use for these transactions any longer and they are rarely (if ever) used
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: Decision made.</p> <p>Mar 30: Re-opened as Epcor Retail potentially has some requirements to use these transactions. Shun F will follow up with them prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>Apr 17: Shun F has confirmed that there is no impact to Epcor Retail so original recommendation stands.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Declined to pursue 	Recommend removal of SSR and SIR transactions from Rule 021

Issue ID	82
-----------------	-----------

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

Issue as identified	New transaction to notify market of new or retired site id
Additional information	Issue 92 (combined into this one) also requests transaction to notify of newly created site id. Site catalogs are very large files which change regularly so it is difficult to extract details on new/ retired site ids.
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: Epcor already publish (on their website) a smaller daily update file for the site catalog which only lists new site ids added. Enmax Power also use an SRE transaction (originally specified as part of eLSI Project) to notify the current retailer for a site when the site id has been retired. Suggest we could use a combination of these two approaches. Paul L has sent a copy of the SRE format for discussion at our next meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">  SRE Transaction Layout.doc </p> <p>Mar 30: SRE reviewed and the possibility of enhancing the SRO transaction also discussed. However, the benefit of the change is for information purposes only and so it was decided that the cost of the change would far outweigh the benefits. The process for Site ID Retirement is already documented adequately in section 7.6 of Rule 021. Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	No change is required: process to remain as is.

Issue ID	83
Issue as identified	Change to SMC transaction process to issue SMC when meter number has changed
Additional information	Both AESO and Enmax Encompass are requesting this change, AESO for compliance reporting purposed, EE to allow for more current information when dealing with customers.
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: Epcor have indicated that they currently don't do this as there would be huge numbers of SMCs being generated if the new reason were added (thousands for meter sampling for example). Fortis and ATCO Electric don't either. Enmax Power however do issue an SMC as their switch out process involves a de-energize/ energize (which is one of the current reasons to issue). Decision made on the basis that there would be significant work involved and the payoff would be relatively small.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Leave reasons to issue an SMC transaction as is.

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	Update the SMC processing rules to indicate that it's not mandatory to issue an SMC where the site has been energized/ de-energized within the same calendar day for a meter switch (i.e. net energize status has not changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	92
Issue as identified	New transaction to indicate creation/ retirement of site id
Additional information	
Discussion	
Recommendation	Mar 4: Decision made
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declined to pursue 	Issue closed - to be discussed in combination with issue 82.

Issue ID	96
Issue as identified	Addition of new reason to issue an SMC transaction when the meter number has changed.
Additional information	
Discussion	
Recommendation	Mar 4: Decision made
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declined to pursue 	Issue closed – same as issue 83.


Issue ID	122
Issue as identified	Change UCI transaction to allow for a second site contact to be added
Additional information	Currently a customer can provide a retailer with a second contact but there is no way to notify the WSP of this in the UCI transaction. There are then problems if the second contact needs to talk to the WSP for some reason.
Discussion	Mar 4: The whole UCI transaction is considered messy and will be an excellent candidate if Rule 021 makes use of XML in the future. Is it possible to use another unused field to capture the info? WSPs don't necessarily load all fields so this approach may not help. There was also discussion around which fields are used most by electricity and gas which may make it difficult to select an alternate field. Also discussed possibility of sending copy of authorization to the WSP but even if it was entered into their system it may then be overwritten by

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	<p>any subsequent UCI. This issue will be discussed again at the next meeting.</p> <p>Mar 30: WSPs have confirmed that they do not load/ use the majority of the info in the UCI transaction. We believe ATCO Gas also have specific requirements here. The transaction does not meet retailer needs either in terms of passing on key contact information. Decision made - the transaction needs to be redesigned completely and this will be referred to the Settlement Working Group at the meeting on March 31.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Assign to SWG at March 31 meeting to confirm need for redesign and set up of special UCI redesign meeting (including ATCO Gas).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	





Issue ID	124
Issue as identified	<p>a) Add a new indicator to SMC transaction Energised Ind to show 'L' for load limited</p> <p>b) Clarification required on issue of SMC where multiple changes occur on one day</p>
Additional information	Retailers need to know asap if a newly enrolled site has a load limiter installed as it is a huge issue for the customer (mostly residential). One WSP also uses a 'C' in this field to indicate 'cut off for non-payment'.
Discussion	<p>Mar 4:</p> <p>a) Decision made</p> <p>b) Already discussed as part of Issue 83</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend allowing a new code 'L' in field 7 of SMC (Energized Ind) to indicate a load limited site. The site is considered energized with this field value and if the value changes a new SMC must be provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	128
Issue as identified	Consistent process required to notify of premise address changes
Additional information	Currently there are varying processes for notifying a retailer when a premise's address changes: email, via site catalog, USA transaction. Need a consistent process between MDMs.
Discussion	Mar 4: Agreement that a consistent process would be helpful. Anne G

	<p>will send the group a copy of ATCO Electric's USA transaction format for discussion at next meeting.</p> <p>Mar 30: There are hundreds of premise address changes per month so it was agreed a new transaction was appropriate in this case. Premise address changes can also impact billing information. Anne G described the current USA transaction and discussion suggested that it needs a 'from' and 'to' address as well as an indicator showing whether this is a cosmetic change (e.g. correcting a typo) or a significant change (e.g. switch of two premise addresses). Anne G will send the group the proposed format of the new transaction for discussion next meeting.</p> <p>Apr 17: The USA transaction currently used by ATCO and the associated process was discussed in detail. In particular, modifying the transaction to include a 'from' address as well as an address swap indicator was looked at. We concluded that too much intelligence was potentially being built in to attempt to flag address swaps which are essentially a type of erroneous enrollment (e.g. customer says he is moving into site A but actually is at site B as addresses have been swapped by developer). However the USA transaction is seen as useful given the number of changes being seen. Decision made.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  ATCO Gas USA Transaction.pdf </div>
<p>Recommendation</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	<p>Recommend addition of the USA transaction as is within Rule 021 to be used by all distributors to notify retailers of premise address changes. Only one USA transaction can be issued in any calendar day for any site.</p> <p>In addition, the wording in section 7.4.9) Erroneous Enrollments should be enhanced to indicate that distributors have a responsibility to notify the retailer of any sites where an address swap has happened and a possible erroneous enrollment may exist. Suggested wording:</p> <p><i>Waiting for wording from Anne G</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

<p>Issue ID</p>	<p>129</p>
<p>Issue as identified</p>	<p>Consistent process to request for load limiter to be removed from a site</p>
<p>Additional information</p>	<p>This is not the notification to the market of a load limiter installation (issue 124) rather the process for requesting removal of a load limiter if the site has changed owner.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Mar 4: Currently there are varying processes in place – Fortis & Epcor use the energize transaction (with request to remove limiter in</p>

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	<p>comments), Enmax Power use de-energize transaction (can't energize an energized site) and ATCO Electric use their own transaction. Discussion suggested that use of the energize transaction is the preferred method. Enmax Power and ATCO Electric will investigate their system implications prior to next meeting and we'll discuss again then.</p> <p>Mar 30: Enmax Power and ATCO Electric are both on side with changing their processes to use the energize transaction to request a load limiter be removed. So it is clear what the proposed process will be, Paul L will draft the recommended process for discussion at the next meeting.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  Proposed Load Limiter Process.doc </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Proposed Load Limiter Processes.vsd </div> </div> <p>Apr 17: The process drafted by Paul L was discussed and it was confirmed that the retailer should only be able to request removal of a load limiter (and not request that one be added, which is a wire owner decision). Option 1 was chosen for removing the limiter and leaving the power on. Decision made.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	<p>Add wording to Rule 021 (suggest section 7) to outline the process for requesting a load limiter be removed. See wording in attached document.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  Microsoft Word Document </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Proposed Load Limiter Processes v2.1 </div> </div>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

<p>Issue ID</p>	<p>133</p>
<p>Issue as identified</p>	<p>Add energized status and tariff rate code to site catalog</p>
<p>Additional information</p>	<p>Adding the rate code would reduce number of erroneous enrollments by allowing retailer to make a better selection from site catalog where there is more than one site at an address (e.g. commercial site vs. yard light). In addition, the energized indicator would let a retailer know whether the site has to be energized immediately (on residential move ins) or have a load limiter removed.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Mar 4: To be discussed again next meeting, based on the following notes.</p> <p>Energized status: there may be privacy implications on showing this detail – the AUC will investigate.</p> <p>Rate code: maybe the profile class or the loss group is a better</p>

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	<p>solution rather than using detail from the Tariff Bill Code. Would also be good to have some indication of whether the site is in an REA – Fortis and Atco Electric will investigate whether this will be possible using one of the suggested codes.</p> <p>Mar 30: Further discussion was held and everyone agreed that both the energized status and type of site was useful for enrollment purposes. Similar to historic usage, the energized status is required by the retailer prior to 'owning' the site (so that move-ins don't go for days without power). Lisa L-Z indicated that the privacy issue was discussed previously but no decision was made and she will see if she has this historical info for next meeting. AUC will also talk to their legal counsel re the privacy issue. Another possible option would be to use a modified SIR transaction to gather the info (see Issue 76). To be discussed again at next meeting when privacy consideration has been confirmed.</p> <p>Apr 17: Research by group members initially suggests that there would not be a privacy issue with adding the energized indicator and the tariff rate code to the site catalog (microgen indicator was added in an earlier revision) – there is no personal information involved. Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Recommend adding an energized indicator (Y, N, or L) and tariff rate code to the site catalog for all sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declined to pursue 	

Issue ID	137
Issue as identified	Clarification on requirements where multiple site characteristics changed in one day
Additional information	What should happen with the energize, de-energize and SMC transactions?
Discussion	<p>Mar 4: already discussed in part in Issue 83. Also could have implications based on the deemed time rules each WSP uses (datetime of DEC & ENC may break deemed time rules). The deemed time rules have been discussed at the SWG level and each WSP has to publish more detail on their own deemed time usage. To be discussed again at next meeting.</p> <p>Mar 30: Anne G is preparing a number of scenarios for the SWG to help clarify the rules on deemed times. In the case of DEC/ ENC on the same calendar date, it is acceptable to have the same deemed Energized Date and Time and De-energized Date and Time but the Transaction Date Time of the two transactions must be different to allow for the correct load sequence. Decision made.</p>
Recommendation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 	Update the Energize/ De-energize processing rules to indicate that it's ok to use the same deemed time when site is de-energized/ energized

AUC Rule 021 – Transactions Subgroup, April 17 '09

	within the same calendar day but that the transaction date time on the two transactions must be different and indicate correct loading sequence. See also action on Issue 83.
• Declined to pursue	