

MSP Performance Monitoring Minutes

May 15 2001

998 W. Washington St, Tempe
SRP Crosscut Facility

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSION
Introduction	Attendance form was distributed.
Review the following documents for areas that could be monitored <ul style="list-style-type: none">•CCN•PSWG UDC Business rule Comparison and <ul style="list-style-type: none">Proposed AZ Best Practices•Metering Form Packet	<p>Assumptions are that the UDC is the monitoring entity.</p> <p><u>CCN document</u> "Information for meter service providers for Arizona Certification" This document was reviewed. No timing requirements were found, however there are safety and technical skills that need to be monitored at a high level or when the PSWG group addresses safety.</p> <p><u>Metering Form packet – Timing issues</u> EMI is info sent by UDC– Nothing applicable to monitor EPA is between ESP and MSP – Nothing applicable to monitor MDCR – this document can be/should be monitored with the timing requirements. THIS INCLUDES SITE MEETS! MIRN – ITEMS #1-7 need to be monitored</p> <p>Jenine Schenk mentioned that occasionally a MIRN may be received, but the MDCR was never sent. Example: Meter exchange took place but it was not scheduled.</p> <p>ESP's could be concerned about MSP scheduling meter exchanges and not showing up. It delays the customer's switch to DA. No ESP's were present to provide input.</p> <p><u>Arizona Business Rule Comparison/ METERING HANDBOOK</u> This document was incorporated into the metering handbook. Participants reviewed the metering handbook for items to monitor. Two Sections were found to need monitoring: Ch 2 is the CCN document (see notes above) 3.10 - Primary metering – whole section – Safety Issue</p> <p>Citizens wants to track MSP response time to fix meter problems. This is something that will be captured when the MADEN process is developed.</p>
How will the areas be monitored?	<p>A problem discussed with monitoring MSP is that most of the tracking will need to be conducted manually—a burden to the UDC's. Pat Cassidy (SRP) mentioned that if all the files were sent via Excel, then it is possible import these files into a database for tracking and inquiry purposes, making tracking slightly less cumbersome.</p> <p>Instead of going to a percentage level and determining which fields on the forms are more important than others. The group has decided to define which criteria the MSP will be monitored on and will allow each UDC to develop their own methods for monitoring and tracking to suit their systems until such time market activity dictates a more rigid state standard must be developed.</p> <p>MDCR will be looked at internally by each UDC for the tracking of timeframes (scheduling/re-scheduling/un-scheduling/and exceptions) prior to determining how monitoring/reporting can be performed on a state level. Example: Monday a schedule comes out for the following Monday's meter exchanges. Something occurs and 3 of the 20 meters must be rescheduled, but the date (5 day prior to meter exchange) is lost and the 3 meters are re-scheduled for Tuesday (tomorrow). How can this be tracked?? Is it really a problem to need to be tracked??</p> <p>MIRN has three major areas to monitor which are "EVENTS" - Unexpected MIRN on initial switch</p>

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSION
--------------	------------

How will the areas be monitored?
Continued . . .

- Late MIRN
- MIRN data incorrect (missing data)

All three "events" are considered equal, and should be counted equally. The process will be based on a percentage of errors of submitted MIRNS in a month (based on service delivery points). Example 1: Five errors on a MIRN is NOT 5 "events", rather it would be counted as one "event". However, if a MIRN is sent several times to rectify the form for a SDP, the number of times the UDC must ask for the correct data will be counted as a "event". Example 2: a form that is sent 4 times from an MSP for a single SDP, would count against the MSP 4 times, i.e. 4 "events". Example 3: A MIRN that is sent late that also has incorrect data counts as TWO "events".

The compliance calculation is determined by:

$$\frac{(\# \text{ Events})}{(\# \text{ Service delivery points that had a MIRN per month})} = \text{Percentage}$$

The group is considering a 10% out of compliance percentage. There must be a dispute period prior to enacting penalties (penalties have yet to be determined).

Add a disclaimer to the document that explains that this is a high-level process and is evolving, subject to change by PSWG.

Report is monthly.

Review ANSI Standards	Postponed to next meeting
Review Agenda Items	Agenda for next meeting was created.
Set Agenda for Next Meeting	Next meeting tentatively scheduled for June 19 th , Grand Canyon State Electric Coop
Wrap-up and Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned.

Agenda for Next Meeting

#	Agenda Item
1	Review and accept Minutes from 5/15/01 Meeting
2	Develop a Draft performance monitoring monthly report
3	Create timeframes and letters for non-compliance including a Dispute process
4	Review ANSI Standards
5	Discuss the 10% non-compliance percentage.
6	Discuss the formula for non-compliance.
7	Review Agenda Items
8	Set Agenda for Next Meeting
9	Wrap-up and Adjourn

Attendance List

Name	Company	E-Mail
Brown, Debbie	SRP	dsbrown@srpnet.com
Cassidy, Pat	SRP	prcassid@srpnet.com
Cobb, Anne	TRICO	acobb@trico.org
Espinoza, Chris	TEP	cespinoza@tucsonelectric.com
Flood, Kathy	SRP	kblood@srpnet.com
Greenrock, June	SRP	jlgreenr@srpnet.com
Henry, Janet	AXON	janethenry@axonfs.com
Schenk, Jenine	APS	sjenine.schenk@aps.com
Slechta, Gene	SRP	gene@systrends.com

Taylor, Judy
Torkelson, LeeAnn
Wallace, John

TEP
CITIZENS/RW BECK
GSECA

jtaylor@tucsonelectric.com
ltorkelson@rwbeck.com
jwallace@gseca.org