

CORRECTED Minutes
Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, May 2nd, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
 SRP – Flagstaff Room
 1600 N. Priest Drive, Tempe

Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1 Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Tony Gillooly	<p>Mr. Gillooly welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the April 18, 2001 meeting were approved with minor changes to items 3, 7, and 9.</p> <p>Jim Wonter (APSES) announced he has taken a position with Pinnacle West and will no longer attend the PSWG meetings.</p>	1 – revised minutes 4/18/01
2 Report from Shirley Renfroe on revised Change Control Process	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Shirley Renfroe (Pinnacle West) presented the revised change control process. She stated that she received no comments on this document. The redlined version participants received at the 4/18 meeting. Will be sent out via e-mail for all members to review.</p> <p>The group had a short discussion on the process. Stacy Aguayo (APS) wonders when the change control process takes affect. After PSWG approves documents, or when the commission approves the document? APS would like to see it take affect when the PSWG approves the document. TEP, CUC and SRP would concur with APS. Jim Wonter (APSES) requested an implementation timeline field be added to the document.</p> <p>Barry Scott (SSVEC) asked what if PSWG unanimously agrees to adopt a process/rule that supercedes the rules of the state and no waiver has been created (see issue 84)? Possibly tie an implementation timeline to the Commission approval of the waiver.</p> <p>Slated for a two-hour discussion at the 5/16/01 meeting to review the document and discuss these associated issues. Including how/where the change control process will be posted on the ACC website. Send any comments to Shirley (Shirley.refroe@pinnaclewest.com) by Monday 5/14/01.</p>	

3	Issue 84 – Final bill Waivers	Judy Taylor	Judy Taylor (TEP) presented draft waivers for the Final Bill and estimating usage for load profiled customers.	2, 3 Draft waivers
<p>The attached documents were created to satisfy both the waiver and to amend the rules. The format of the documents quotes the rules on pages 1 and 2 with all new language IN CAPITALS. The task also included citing specific examples when estimation may occur. Examples are shown in <i>italics</i>. These examples were added, but TEP's legal staff suggests that these instances NOT be put in the rules because it may end up being too limiting in the future.</p>				
<p>John Wallace (GSECA) suggested re-arranging the text. The drafts presented appear to be more of a rule change request than a true waiver. A waiver is needed to get immediate relief from the inability to estimate, possibly list examples why estimation may occur in the waiver. Create a second document separating the proposed rule language changes.</p>				
<p>Barbara Keene (Staff) suggested that it may be better include rule changes in a separate document, but still attach to the waiver. Barbara will check which documentation is preferred (one or two documents).</p>				
<p><u>ACTION ITEM</u></p>				
<p>Judy Taylor will confirm with Barbara (Staff) that two separate documents are appropriate and revise the documents according to Staff's recommendations. New drafts will be passed out at the 5/16 meeting.</p>				
4	Staff reported on the legalities of sending the warning letters to ESP's regarding the performance of their MRSPs in other ESP territories (Issue 101)	ACC Staff	<p>Staff does not have an answer at this time, agenda item postponed to next meeting</p> <p>A comment from TEP:</p> <p>TEP's position is that if performance monitoring of MRSPs is aggregated at the ESP level, then the ESP should conduct the MRSP performance monitoring, not the UDC. TEP will send a PMR to the ESP not a warning letter would only contact the ESP associated with the MRSP having problems. The current process has the UDC sending warning letters to the MRSP. The legal issue is contacting all ESPs in the UDC territory when the MRSP is may only be performing poorly with a specific in one ESPs territory.</p>	
5	Report from Staff regarding adding the missing UDCs to the metering forms data elements table	ACC Staff	Staff does not have an answer at this time, agenda item postponed to next meeting	
6	Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 101: MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing	John Wallace	John Wallace (GCSECA) reported on the progress of the task team. MRSP meeting slated for May 3 rd , 2001. No new information at this time.	

7	Issue 61: MSP Performance Monitoring and Testing Brainstorming Session 1 hour discussion	John Wallace	<p>The group brainstormed ideas/concepts on what criteria to monitor Meter Service Providers.</p> <p>TEP submitted a proposal for MSP performance monitoring.</p> <p>Stacy (APS): Does it make sense to create a PM packet based on current standards and then update and change the document and standards as they evolve? Safety is a primary concern for APS and is a priority item to monitor. An example of safety criteria: How well did an MSP install that equipment/meter.</p> <p>TEP believes PSWG must monitor something, using current PSWG and ACC approved documents.</p> <p>Jenine Schenk (APS) and June Greenrock (SRP) declared it would be difficult to track the documents and are concerned about defining what are problems/events. The flow of documents for MSP is a more manual process (as compared to the MRSP process) so tracking is a burden to the Utilities.</p> <p>The group came to a consensus that at a high-level, performance monitoring can be done and the task team should reconvene. The MSP task team has been assigned to review the ACC CC&N, Business rule Comparison / Proposed Arizona Best Practices, and the Metering Form Packet and determine high level processes (areas) to monitor MSPs. At this point, thresholds to establish decertification and warning letters have NOT been assigned.</p> <p>An item to keep in mind for future meetings: Performance monitoring tracking for the monthly PMR may be based on a percentage of errors of errors on transactions with that MSP on a daily basis. (Example: 25 transactions on Monday with 5 errors is a 20% error for the day).</p> <p><u>ACTION ITEM</u></p> <p>The task team will present a draft of the Performance Monitoring Report at the July 11 meeting. The document must contain the high level monitoring criteria and how the MSP will be monitored.</p>	4 – TEP's MSP Perf. Monit proposal
---	---	--------------	--	------------------------------------

- 8 Issue 75: On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR hand-book does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations
- Tony Gillooly
- TEP and CUC presented how each wanted DASRs submitted when there are multiple meters at a site.
- TEP requests one DASR for kWh meter (per service delivery point). If KVAR meter were required, then that meter would be replaced with one meter that monitors both kVAR and kWh. If the kVAR meter were to be removed, TEP would remove it prior to the MSP installation.
- Citizens concurs with APS and SRP that one DASR should be sent in the case where there is both a kWh meter and kVAR meter.
- The group agreed to close issue 75 as resolved, the DASR should be sent under the kWh meter number. However, other meter combinations including totalized meters and accounts with both metered and unmetered services needs to be addressed. Issue 116 was added to the issues list to address these additional Issues.
- 9 Approval of field requirement in the AZ 810 to Conditional from Mandatory
- Tony Gillooly
- The group discussed whether the beginning and ending read should be conditional or optional.
- TEP commented that the field is acceptable as “conditional” with the addition of the following verbiage: “If the customer is a residential customer, the field is required. A file sent by TEP will always have the read present”. TEP requests this additional verbiage so that future trading partners cannot require TEP to change their computer system to filter out this information.
- Consensus was achieved that the field is conditional. However, wording for the greybox and how to incorporate SRP’s unique situation (not providing reads for residential customers over 20kw when they are not the MRSP) has not been determined. This may be clarified if PSWG knows if SRP will ever be able to send the reads for this situation.
- The ESP’s responded to the SRP MRSP issue at the 4/18 meeting, no further discussion was needed.
- ACTION ITEM**
- SRP will determine if they intend to provide the reads, or have no intention of ever providing the reads.
- Participants: Look at MEA06 field in the demand measurement segment. It is currently listed as conditional. Is this field necessary? If it’s necessary what are the conditions?
- TEP will re-evaluate the requirement that they will always send the read and determine the impact of always sending the reads if the receiving partner does not need the reads.

10	Future meeting locations	Tony Gillooly	It was agreed and a schedule was set for every three weeks. SRP and APS and Grand Canyon will work out the locations. A schedule of dates with locations will be presented at the May 16 th meeting. Dates for future meetings are: July 11, August 1 and 22, September 12, October 3 and 24, November 14, and December 5.
11	Issue 71 If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer prior to switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected. (PSWG – Billing)	Tony Gillooly	<p>The group discussed and agreed to reject the DASR in this scenario with the appropriate reason code. Issue is resolved.</p> <p><u>TEP</u>: DASR would be rejected if customer were delinquent. The comments field would state the reason why the DASR was rejected.</p> <p><u>APS</u>: Customer would still be allowed to go DA if they were behind in payments. ESP will be notified, but no formal process has been set up.</p> <p><u>SRP</u>: Its an internal process, but it would reject DASR and figure out the meter issue</p> <p><u>CUC</u>: Citizens would contact the ESP by fax or e-mail of scheduled disconnect date. If the customer were disconnected, then Citizens would send a TS DASR. However, it was noted a TS DASR may only be sent by the UDC when 1) the ESP is de-certified or 2) when the UDC receives a RQ DASR from another ESP. Citizens will agree to reject the DASR. CITIZENS cannot REJECT the RQ DASR. THIS ISSUE MUST RE-OPEN</p> <p>Issue 71 only covers the instance where an RQ DASR is sent prior to a switch. What happens AFTER a customer has switched to DA? A new issue (#117) was added to the master issues log to address this issue.</p>
12	Issue 76 On DASR – forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR?		The group discussed the issue and agreed this field is required; the EMI process depends on receiving this information from the DASR. Issue is resolved.
13	Issue 60 According to the Rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)		The group discussed the issue and determined that this is not a quick hitter. This is a process requiring a task team with scenarios covering different billing options. Other questions to discuss: What happens when a customer switches ESPs one or more times? What happens if the third party to bill is no longer in business? What information is placed on the bill? Who is the bill sent to?
14	Review Open issues and re-prioritize	Tony Gillooly	The group deferred this item to the next meeting, as the agenda for 05/16/01 is full.

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|------------------|---|
| 15 | New Issues | Tony
Gillooly | New issues added to the Master Issue list:
ISSUE 116: On incoming DASR State DASR handbook does not accommodate totalized metering or other metering combinations including metered and unmetered accounts.
ISSUE 117: If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer AFTER the switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected? |
| 16 | Meeting Evaluation | Tony
Gillooly | The group provided feedback. |
| 17 | Set Next Agenda | Tony
Gillooly | The group set the next agenda. |
| 18 | Adjourn Meeting | Tony
Gillooly | The meeting was adjourned. |

PARTICIPANT LIST

MAY 2ND, 2001
PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Brandt, Jana	SRP
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Cassidy, Pat	SRP
Cobb, Anne	TRICO
Gillooly, Tony	TEP
Greenrock, June	SRP
Henry, Janet	AXON
Keene, Barbara	Commission Staff
Lincoln, Matthew	SRP
McArthur, Stephen	Mohave
Renfroe, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Scott, Barry	SSVEC
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA
Wonter, Jim	APSES