

MSP Performance Monitoring Minutes

June 19, 2001

120 North 44th Street, Phoenix

AGENDA TOPIC

DISCUSSION

1. Introduction

Attendance form was distributed. Minutes from the May 15th meeting were reviewed with minor corrections to sentence structure.

2. Develop a Draft performance monitoring monthly report

This is the text portion of the document.

Alternatives for performance monitoring submitted by Citizens.

- 1) UDC's compile the data and send it to the ACC for performance rating in the state. The group didn't think Staff would be amenable to this work. Action item LeeAnn: Contact staff to see if they would be willing to do such a consolidation of data and post it.
- 2) UDC's compile the raw data and send it to the ESP for their analysis, set up the process to have the ESP perform the performance monitoring report. The group determined that this might be an item to address in the future, but at this time SRP, TEP, and APS do not like this alternative because they prefer direct contact with the MSP.
- 3) Citizens would like to set up PM to be between the ESP and UDC only. Any problems the UDC has will be routed through the ESP first. After discussion from the group, it is vital to contact the MSP first. Example #1: It may be faster to correct a problem on a MIRN by contacting the MSP first rather than routing problems through ESP. Example #2: The ACC may not think its appropriate to contact a third party prior to the MSP having the problem. Example #3: Contacting the ESP and assuming that they will contact their MSP, may allow the MSP to say, "I was never contacted".

Jenine Schenk (APS) suggested a simplified report format where all that is reported are total monthly installed meters and total problems at service delivery points in a UDC's territory. This removes the separate reports per ESP/MSP relationship and removes the potential need for two separate performance monitoring reports because it violates confidential agreements between ESP and MSP. The ESP and MSP will get individual event notifications and will be able to analyze the report from the event notifications, so details are not needed on the summary report. Details of the daily event summary must be discussed so that the information traded is standard.

Consensus was reached with:

On an event notification basis, the MSP will be contacted directly with the notification copied to the ESP that has a contractual relationship with that MSP. The monthly report (on an aggregate level) will be sent to ESPs that have a contractual relationship with that MSP.

Additionally, the report should indicate how many of the total exceptions were late MIRNS, MIRNS with bad data, MIRC data incorrect (missing data). See sample monthly summary report.

The report should be sent later than the first of the month because of the 3 day lag for late MIRNS. Example: A meter exchange occurred on June 30th, the return of the MIRC is not considered late until July 3rd. The report should not be sent until the 5th or later.

The report summary will be prepared on the basis of a UDC's service territory and will NOT be by ESP.

Jenine Schenk (APS) will create a draft of the report text for the next meeting.

3. Create timeframes and letters for non-compliance including a Dispute process

The summary report is sent seven (7) business days from the end of the month with a 5-business day dispute period from the date of receipt before the report is final.

The informal complaint process is as follows: The staff will try to get the two

	parties together and solve the problem informally. If staff cannot come to some resolution, then a formal complaint process will begin. In effect, staff is working as a mediator.
3. Continued . . .	The warning letter is sent to the MSP and copied to the ESP when the MSP is out of compliance. The UDC will send an informal complaint letter to the Utilities director when in a rolling 12-month period the MSP is out of compliance three (3) of those months. In the third warning letter, language indicates that an informal complaint letter to the Utilities Director is attached and has been sent to the Utilities Director. Warning Letters were drafted from the MRSP letters and will be reviewed next meeting.
4. Review ANSI Standards	These standards really apply to equipment and not to the actual work an MSP may do. No one sees how it would be possible to monitor any of these standards.
5. Discuss the 10% non-compliance percentage.	As a starting point, this value seems valid, until Market participation indicates otherwise.
ADDED AGENDA ITEM: Items to include on a daily event notification	The group decided that the vital information to include on a daily event notification includes: Customer name, UNI, service address, and new meter number (meter install number), type of event (Unexpected MIRN on initial switch, late MIRN, or MIRN Data incorrect), MIRN file name (ex MIRN06192000APSESCUC1.xls)
6. Discuss the formula for non-compliance.	Again, the formula seems appropriate at this point in time.
7. Review Agenda Items	Agenda for next meeting was created.
8. Set Agenda for Next Meeting	Next meeting is scheduled for July 9 th , 2000, Grand Canyon State Cooperative Facilities
9. Wrap-up and Adjourn	Meeting was adjourned.

Agenda for Next Meeting

Monday July 9th, 2001

9:30 to 4:00 – Grand Canyon State Cooperative Facilities

#	Agenda Item
1	Review and accept Minutes from 6/19/01 Meeting
2	Review the draft performance monitoring monthly report TEXT
3	Review the draft Meter installation performance monitoring summary
4	Review the draft timeframes and letters for non-compliance
5	Review the items to include on a daily event notification
6	Review Agenda Items
7	Set Agenda for Next Meeting
8	Wrap-up and Adjourn

Attendance List

Name	Company
Cassidy, Pat	SRP
Flood, Kathy	SRP
Molina, Rick	TEP
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	CITIZENS/RW BECK
Wallace, John	GSECA