

Minutes
Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, September 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

SRP – Flagstaff room ISB – 1600 N. Priest Drive, Tempe

Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1 Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Evelyn Dryer	<p>Ms. Dryer welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Minutes from the August 22, 2001 meeting were approved with this revision:</p> <p>Item #10: New issues: Need to correct sentence by saying “PSWG” was unable to get the signature of Morenci, not “TEP” was unable to get the signature.</p> <p>Schedule notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The October 3rd meeting has been re-scheduled to September 26 at Grand Canyon Cooperative facilities. ▪ The primary metering meeting Wednesday September 19, APS 5th floor. <p>Note: LeeAnn (RW BECK/CITIZENS) can no longer take minutes. TEP’s suggestion to develop a schedule to share the responsibility of minute taking was approved. Each utility will be responsible for minute taking for the meeting assigned to them.</p>	

2 Metering Handbook Issue 107: Stacy Aguayo

Stacy Aguayo (APS) indicated that the document with revisions from last meeting have been completed, but were not submitted to Tony Gillooly (TEP). The group did not discuss section 3.10. It will be discussed at the September 19th, 2001 metering meeting at APS.

The group reviewed APS's comments to Citizens document posing questions and concerns about the handbook.

Item 1:

New sections added to the document will require the PSWG to review the handbook and update/correct those sections (through the change control process) that may be affected by the newly created section. The group consensus is that it is okay to submit the document that is incomplete to establish to ESPs what is a standard at this time.

Item #2

Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed.

Item #3

Group consensus indicated this item needs to be addressed

Action Item: All Utilities:

What would legal departments suggest rather than use the word "certified" in this section

Item #4

Group consensus indicated the need to revisit the requirements of the meter display.

Item #5

First bullet. Does not need further addressing. The section is intended to meet the requirement of 1612 L.15

Second Bullet: Needs further addressing. The group should review section 1.4 with section 3.4.

The group stopped reviewing the APS comments to Citizens concerns at this point. The group decided not to submit the document in its current state to the Utilities Director. Further Discussion and changes need to be made at a future meeting.

Action Item: All Utilities

Each utility needs to address the comments by Citizens (similar to what APS did). Each Utility will draft language in areas where appropriate.

Comments need to be sent to Mary Ippolito by October 8th and consolidated comments will be sent out by October 15th by Stacy (APS). New item #19 for the list: address the document to make sure that MRSP references are appropriate. Will be discussed October 24th.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|---|
| 3 | Discussion with Steve Olea regarding the future of PSWG and task teams. | Evelyn Dryer | <p>A special meeting of the PSWG will be held September 26 to allow for Mr. Olea's attendance. This special meeting will replace the meeting scheduled for October 3rd. At the Sept. 26th meeting Mr. Olea will address questions from the group and answer the question: Will the Commission support documents drafted by the PSWG without market participation?</p> <p>Some initial comments from Erinn Andreason (Commission) from Steve Olea indicated that it does appear to be difficult to proceed without ESP, MRSP, and MSP participation. He would like to see a master issues list especially pertaining to ESP/MRSPs/MSPs with non-technical explanations of the issue. Without feedback from these entities, it may be difficult to proceed.</p> <p>In response to this request, the group determined most of the list requires market participation and issues is written in layman's terms already.</p> <p>A second comment from Mr. Olea regarding the PSWG concern about documents that are not supported by 2/3 of the involved parties under current PSWG voting rules. He offered the suggestion the PSWG consider simple majority rather than the current 2/3 majority.</p> <p>In response to this suggestion, 2/3 was chosen as a voting standard because the utilities could outvote ESPs at any given time. Or alternately, the big utilities could outvote the smaller utilities and or cooperatives under simple majority.</p> |
| 4 | Issue 131 - Does Citizens need a waiver, or is there a work around for CUC to be in compliance with the 5- Day response to the DASR? | Evelyn Dryer | <p>LeeAnn Torkelson (Citizens/ RW Beck) reported on the action item if Citizens accepts or rejects the RQ DASR in this case. If the customer has an account number, the RQ DASR (under a manual process) could be accepted</p> <p>After much discussion, the PSWG determined a waiver is not needed if Citizens can respond by rejecting the RQ DASR with appropriate code and comment in the "comments" field.</p> <p>Citizens should expect the ESP to contact Citizens and ask for further explanation and work the DASR in a manual process.</p> <p>Issue remains open pending an answer to the action item.</p> <p>Action Item: Citizens</p> <p>Paul Taylor (RW BECK/Citizens) will determine if Citizens can respond using appropriate codes and comments to reject the DASR.</p> |
| Agenda items 5 – 12 were determined to be "quick hitters" to resolve or send to task team. | | | |
| 5 | Issue 112 - Develop a master list of all acceptable meters within each UDC territory | Evelyn Dryer | <p>The group discussed and resolved the issue by identifying in the metering Handbook (section 3.2) that states "refer to specific UDC".</p> <p>Each ESP will have to go to each Utility to get the approved meter list for that service territory.</p> |
| 6 | Issue 113- - Do the performance standards created for MRSPs and MSPs apply to the UDCs? | Evelyn Dryer | <p>The group discussed the issue and initial thoughts were that performance standards created for MRSPs and MSPs for direct access customer apply to UDCs. After further discussion, it was group consensus that the issue cannot be resolved until there is market participation from the MRSPs/MSPs (do they intend to monitor UDCs? Would they use the same standards?).</p> <p>Additionally Non-IDR VEE standard needs to be created to complete the picture for performance monitoring.</p> <p>Issue will remain on the issues list until market participation is involved and a Non-IDR VEE standard is created.</p> |

7	Issue 114- What are (are there) state the timing requirements for meter testing?	Evelyn Dryer	The group discussed the issue and determined there are no state standards. This issue is resolved by answering the question. Any state meter testing and timing requirements will be addressed with issue 107—the metering handbook.
8	Issue 115 - How will kVAR meters be removed when both kVAR and kWh meters are present at a site and an MSP installs a single meter that can read both kVAR and kWh?	Evelyn Dryer	The group resolved the issue by stating there will be no state standard. Each utility will have a different practice.
9	Issue 124 - The appearance is dissimilar between MRSP and MSP performance monitoring documents. Should these be consolidated into the same book with consistent formatting?	Evelyn Dryer	The issue was discussed, all utilities believe the documents should be separate. They are two different processes for potentially different entities. Resolve the issue
10	Issue 126 - Should the VEE document remain a stand-alone document?	Evelyn Dryer	TEP recommended and other utilities, other than CUC, agreed that the VEE and MRSP Performance monitoring documents be combined as a start of an MRSP Handbook. Issue will remain open to see if Citizens can agree with consensus to combine the documents. Action Item: Citizens Determine if Citizens agrees the documents should be combined as the start of an MRSP handbook.
11	Issue 127 - What are the transmission related responsibilities of a UDC in the DA environment, and what ability does it have to set criteria relating to an ESPs energy portfolio?	Evelyn Dryer	PSWG is keeping it open to remind participants of issues that may impact PSWG in the future.
12	Issue 132 - Identify chapters in the metering handbook that would be easy for the UDCs to address (i.e. Stickers, labels, trouble calls, etc).	Evelyn Dryer	Clarification: this topic is supposed to identify topics in the metering handbook that requires only UDC input (not MSPs/ESPs/MRSPs input) After discussion it was decided to resolve the issue because the group can start drafts of all open sections.

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 13 | Discuss and Review the Top 5 issues | John
Wallace | <p>The group determined these issues will be discussed for one hour next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issue 116 – On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR hand-book does not accommodate totalized metered, and metered – unmetered account combinations ▪ Issue 123 – Citizens CIS system requires a meter number on accepting the TS DASR, but this DASR doesn't have the meter number as a requirement. What changes can be made to accommodate this. ▪ Issue 103 – Day of Removal (Day of install issue 41) ▪ Issue 52 – UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and re-solving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and UDCs (APSES) ▪ Issue 107 – Finishing Chapters of Metering Handbook <p>Action Item: All Utilities</p> <p>Develop paper commenting on the topics. How process is currently done, suggestions. Bring to the next meeting.</p> |
| 14 | New Issues | Evelyn
Dryer | No new issues were added to the Master Issue list: |
| 15 | Review Open issues and re-prioritize | John
Wallace | The group reviewed Open issues and re-prioritized them. |
| 16 | Meeting Evaluation | Evelyn
Dryer | The group provided feedback. |
| 17 | Set Next Agenda | Evelyn
Dryer | The group set the next agenda. |
| 18 | Adjourn Meeting | Evelyn
Dryer | The meeting was adjourned. |

****Any of the above agenda items may be voted on and approved as a standard by the PSWG****

Participants at the September 12, 2001 PSWG meeting:

Name	Organization (new e-mail address, if appropriate)
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Andreasen, Erinn	Commission Staff
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Dryer, Evelyn	TEP
Flood, Kathy	SRP
Gillooly, Tony	TEP
Moyer, June	SRP (jlmoyer@srpnet.com)
Renfroe, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Taylor, Paul	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA