Minutes:
Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

Friday, January 7, 2000 - Hearing Rooms 1 & 2
Arizona Corporation Commission - 1200 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

	Topic	*Lead*	*Outcome*	*Att.*
1	Welcome and Review of Meeting Agenda	Deb Scott ACC	Deb Scott clarified purpose and expected outcome[s] from meeting.	
2	Review and Approval of minutes from 12.03.99 meeting	Deb Scott	Approved minutes with minor corrections. Please see revised minutes displayed as Attachment 1.	1
3	Introduction of and Explanation of the Role of Facilitators: *Laurie Goggin, Trisha Sorensen*	Deb Scott, Laurie Goggin City of Mesa	Members met and heard the qualifications of facilitators.	
4	Warm-up and Introductions	Laurie Goggin	Participants become familiar with each other and the facilitators. See list of participants displayed as Attachment 2. Members participated in an exercise of recording their hopes for successful conclusion of the Work's Groups task. Please see Attachment 3.	2,3
5	Review of Working Group Charge and Deliverables and ACC Staff Role	Deb Scott	Deb reviewed the charge, deliverable, and role of ACC staff. She stated that ACC staff will not be voting on group decisions, but will be attending meetings of the group and its subcommittees to provide staff support and technical help. She further stated that, in response to the ACC Order, staff will be filing a separate report/commentary, but will not insert staff comments into the text of the group's report.	
6	Appointment of Chairperson	Deb Scott	Evelyn Dryer, TEP, was selected Chairperson	
7	Facilitated Group Discussion and Organization of Subcommittees: *Action Plan, Schedule, Timeline to Respond to Charge and Produce Deliverables*	Laurie Goggin	Group agreed to a meeting schedule and identified subcommittees. Various members volunteered to chair subcommittees. Participants volunteered to populate subcommittees. The group agreed that subcommittees would meet on Wednesdays and Thursdays, weekly to begin with. Please see Attachment 4 for more detail.	4
7	Facilitated Group Discussion: *Group Operating Principles and Ground Rules*	Trisha Sorensen	Group agrees to a set of operating principles, ground rules, and voting rules. Please see Attachment 5 for detail.	5
10	Meeting Evaluation	Laurie Goggin	Verbal reports from attendees indicated that they felt that the meeting was productive and well managed.	
11	Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.	

REVISED SPECIAL OPEN MEETING MINUTES
APPROVED JANUARY 7, 2000

DATE: December 3, 1999

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

PLACE: Arizona Corporation Commission
Hearing Rooms 1 & 2
1200 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ATTENDANCE:
No Quorum of Commissioners
Members of Commission Staff
Members of Process Standardization Working Group
which includes representatives from APS, TEP, Citizens, AEPCO, Trico Electric Cooperative, Navopache Electric Cooperative, Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Salt River Project, APS Energy Services, New West Energy, New Energy, RUCO, Phaser, K.R. Saline & Associates, Star Data Services, Cell Net, ECC, RW Beck, Energy Consulting and Design, and Cognizant Technology Solutions.

TOPIC: **PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP MEETING**

MATTERS DISCUSSED:

Utilities Division Director Deb Scott welcomed all the participants in the Working Group and thanked everyone for volunteering to participate in developing process standardization. Ms. Scott indicated that the Working Group had a considerable amount of work to perform in order to present a report to the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) by June 15, 2000.

Ms. Stacy Aguayo and Ms. Shirley Renfroe of Arizona Public Service (APS) presented a report (Attachment #1) on the Coalition for Uniform Business Rules (CUBR). CUBR has formed a Standard Electronic Transactions (SET) group to help develop nationwide Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) protocols for use in electric and gas competition. The SET group is meeting on a monthly schedule. APS has sent some personnel to these meetings and other Working Group participants indicated that they had attended some SET meetings. The SET group currently has drafts available for EDI 867, 814, 810, 820, and 824 protocols. The EDI 650 and 568 protocols are incomplete. The Edison Electric Institute has also established a Uniform Business Process (UBP) working group to look at standardizing business rules. APS is also sending personnel to these meetings. It was also mentioned that NARUC would begin looking at uniform business rules early next year.

APS recommended that all participants should review the CUBR document and determine if the documents are helpful for the Working Group. If there is enough interest in the CUBR document, the working group will use it as a

guide. Please email your mailing Address to Ron Franquero to get a copy of the CUBR document.

As an alternative to using CUBR information, Mr. Greg Lizak from Star Data Services indicated that the state of Nevada has developed most of the EDI protocols for its use in electric competition. Mr. Ron Franquero will contact the Nevada PUC and obtain a copy of their protocols and send them to all participants for review prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Renee Castillo of Salt River Project presented a report (Attachments #2 and #3) on the EDI 810 Standardization work group. This work group was originally formed as a subgroup under the Unbundled Services Billing and Collections Committee in September 1999. The Workgroup has held 4 meetings and has achieved the following: (1) 85 percent completion on the UDC to ESP business function identification; (2) Identifying and documented the business rules for UDC to ESP functions; and, (3) Has identified 17 outstanding issues. Twelve of these issues have been resolved. The next steps involve creation of implementation guidelines for EDI 810 for UDC to ESP Consolidated Billing.

Mr. Ron Franquero then presented a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment #4) on the goals, objectives, and key issues that were submitted by each participant. APSES's comments were inadvertently left off this presentation and are included as Attachment #5. After reviewing each participant's goals, objectives, and key issues, the Staff proposals were discussed. Most of the participants preferred to have an independent facilitator rather than let Staff do the facilitation. Staff will investigate the use of an independent facilitator. Darrell Pichoff, K. R. Saline & Associates offered to find a neutral facilitator. There were also some questions on the voting requirements, including the use of proxy voting. Mr. Larry Nuszlock from SRP requested that the Working Group needed to develop a goal. Mr. Ron Franquero recommended that SRP's goal should be used as the Working Group's goal. All of these items will be discussed at the next meeting.

ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT MEETING:

Participants will review the voting requirements and the Working Group goals and objectives.

The next meeting was scheduled for December 16, 1999.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Ron Franquero
Utilities Consultant
December 10, 1999

ATTENDANCE LIST ATTACHED

Goals of Participants for the Successful Conclusion of the Work Group's Charge

- The process will have occurred on a level playing field.
- There will be complete and total participation and involvement from everyone.
- The process will set a positive example of partnership in developing important business rules.
- There will be positive relationship throughout and following the process.
- The process of collaboration will continue after June 15, 2000.
- The products will be satisfactory to everyone involved.
- The proposals will be cost-effective.
- There will be no time wasting.
- There will be real partnerships developed as a result of the process.
- The products will be 'down to earth' and practical.
- There will be excellent communication among the parties involved in the process.
- The process will result in actual, experimental, real world prototype business processes.
- The group and its subcommittees will have exercised good judgment.
- There will be open architecture.
- We will be able to have such a clear product that subsequent rule making will be easy, quick, and to the point.
- The proposals developed will be flexible enough to adapt to change.
- Others who judge the process and its results will say that the group did a great job, the antithesis of the 'telephone experience'.
- The products recommended will be balanced and fair.
- There will be a team formed for ongoing implementation issues, based on the example set by this process as an effective way for a group to address complex, controversial issues.
- The process will have been challenging, fair, fun, and frustrating.
- The products are so clear and fair that the participants do not have to defend their actions against naysayers.
- The vast majority of the participants are happy with the products of the group effort.
- The group stayed focused during its deliberations.
- There is clarity in how all the recommended business processes, electronic platforms, and policy issues that still need resolution articulate with one another.
- As a result of the group's recommendations, electric deregulation can be implemented without costing the customer 'an arm and a leg'.
- There are cordial, professional relationships and partnerships developed between competitors.

Attachment 4 – Arizona Corporation Commission Process Standardization Working Group – 1.07.00

Meeting Schedule and Subcommittee Assignments/Meeting Times, Housekeeping Details

Large Group Meeting Schedule

February 23, 2000 9:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.

April 5, 2000 9:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.

May 3, 2000 9:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.

May 31, 2000 9:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.

NOTE: All meetings at this location:
Mesa Community Center
263 North Center Street, Apache Room
Mesa, Arizona 85201
(480) 644-2178

Subcommittee Assignments, Membership, Meeting Times

Group	Chair	Membership	ACC Staff Assigned	Facilitator	Meeting Time
Consolidated Billing & Settlement with Scheduling Coordinators [EDI 810]	Shirley Renfroe	Renee Castillo,, APS Jack White, Darrel Pichoff, K.R. Saline Janie Mollon, New West Energy Mikki Sampson. Citizens Dan Laos, AEPCO Stephen McArthur, Mohave Anne Cobb, TEP Paul O'Dair,Navopache Elec Coop. Evelyn Dryer, TEP Merilyn Ferrara, APS Energy Services Barb Klemstine, APS Energy Services Ray Wenzel, Excelergy Stacy Aguayo, APS Matt Lincoln	Bill Rigsby	Trisha Sorensen	Wednesday AM
DASR [EDI 814]	Janie Mollon	Renee Castillo, SRP Judy Taylor, TEP Darrel Pichoff, K. R. Saline Mikki Sampson, Citizens Dan Laos, AEPCO John Merideth, AEPCO Stephen McArthur, Mohave Elec. Coop Ann Cobb, TEP Paul O'Dair, Navopache	Barbara Keene	Laurie Goggin	Wednesday PM

Group	Chair	Membership	ACC Staff Assigned	Facilitator	Meeting Time
		Stacy Aguayo, APS Ray Wenzel, Excelergy Merilyn Ferrara, APS Energy Services Barbara Klemstine, APS Energy Services Shirley Renfroe, APS Stacy Aguayo, APS Matt Lincoln, SRP			
Remittance Advice to Bank & Transaction Errors [EDI 820 and 824]	Renee Castillo	Judy Taylor, TEP Darrel Pichoff, K. R. Saline Janie Mollon,, New West Energy Anne Cobb, TEP Shirley Renfroe, APS Stacy Aguayo, APS	Crystal Brown	Laurie Goggin	Thursday AM
Metering Information [includes transaction errors] [EDI 650]	Stacy Aguayo Darrel Pichoff	Renee Castillo, SRP Marv Buck Darrel Pichoff, K. R. Saline Janie Mollon, New West Energy Bud Haas, Citizens John Merideth, AEPCO Dennis Hughes, Anne Cobb, TEP Evelyn Dryer, TEP James Wontor, APS Energy Services Shirley Renfroe, APS Matt Lincoln, SRP	Bob Gray	Laurie Goggin	Thursday PM
Change Control Process, Policy Review, Security, and Transport	Evelyn Dryer	Shirley Renfroe, APS Stacy Aguayo, APS Darrel Pichoff, K. R. Saline Janie Mollon, New West Energy ReneeCastillo, SRP Barry Scott Doug Nelson Lee Wilfert Merilyn Ferrara, APS Energy Services Mike Ross, R. W. Beck Jim Wontorm APS Energy Services Larry Nuszloch, SRP		Laurie Goggin	As Needed

Establish Procedural / Housekeeping Details

1. ACC will pay the rental for meeting rooms.

2. The following companies have agreed to underwrite lunches: SRP, APS, TEP, AEPCO, Citizens' Utility.

3. Agendas for the working group and its subcommittee will be sent out a minimum of 2 working days prior to any meeting.

4. All group participants will be noticed on all subcommittee meetings.

5. Subcommittee reports shall contain the following, at a minimum:
   - Recommendations on the business process[es] that should be used for a given transaction
   - Recommendations on the electronic/communication platform standards to be used for each process.
   - Recommendations concerning implementation issues – both short-term and long-term
   - Any other recommendations germane to the focus area assigned.

6. Subcommittees have the authority to make decisions/recommendations on the processes that they have been assigned. Subcommittees will bring their entire recommendation package to the full group for a vote. The large group will vote on the entire package of recommendations; not individual pieces.

7. Subcommittees will allow participation through electronic methods.

8. Subcommittees will report progress at each full group meeting.

Process Standardization Working Group
Operating Principles, Ground Rules, and Voting Qualifications

Operating Principles	1. The interests of all stakeholders will be considered, irrespective of their presence. 2. The group will be open to new ideas, processes, and ways of doing business. **3. "Best Practices" will be used as resources in guiding the recommendations of the group and its subcommittees.** 4. Recommendations should consider the economic consequences to all market participants. 5. All market participants must utilize the format that is recommended by the group. 6. The group will be open to reinventing processes. 7. The group will agree to a solution and/or set of recommendations for each process. 8. The group and its subcommittees will operate by consensus insofar as possible.
Meeting Ground Rules	1. The results of the group's deliberations will be shared openly and in a timely manner with all market participants. 2. The PSWG will revisit decisions made at a previous meeting, using the guidelines of its established change control process. 3. Implementation issues will be documented and discussed in the group's final report, separate from recommendations on process standards. 4. The group will develop recommendations and a proposed timeline for both interim and long-term process standardization changes. 5. Meeting agendas will be adhered to. New issues will be calendared for future meetings.
Voting Qualifications	1. Subcommittees: 75% majority of those in attendance will be required to move an issue to consideration by the full group. 2. Full Group: A simple majority will hold sway on issues. 3. A person can vote, either at the subcommittee or group level, if: ▪ He/she [or the organization he/she represents] is bound to live with the vote Or ▪ He/she [or the organization he/she represents] has a CC&N pending or approved by the ACC Or ▪ He/she represents an affected utility or are under the jurisdiction of the ACC AND ▪ He/she has been an active participant in the work group [through presence or via electronic means]. 4. Each voting person shall have one vote. No voting entity shall have more than one voting person. 5. SRP may vote if they produce a letter from SRP management indicating the organization's intent to be bound by ACC rules affecting electric deregulation.