

Distribution Access Rule Task Force Minutes of Meeting #3 February 16, 2000

Attendance list: attached.

Agenda: distributed in advance; copy attached.

The minutes of Meetings #1 (Jan 19/2000) and #2 (Feb 2/2000) were approved.

1. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Working Assumption Regarding Customer Mobility

If the Electricity Retail Settlement Code determines the issue of customer mobility, the Task Force agrees to accept the policy principles reflected in that document as the working assumption for the mobility issue in the context of the Distribution Access Rule for natural gas.

Terms and Conditions of the SSO

Kathi reported that B. Hewson expects that the terms & conditions of the SSO offerings of the utilities will be addressed in their respective rate cases. But there was some concern that M. Garner may not have the same view. ***Kathi will check with Mark and report back.*** The questions are:

- Is it the Board's intention to direct the utilities to bring forward SSO terms & conditions in their next rate cases, or will the issue only be addressed if some party makes an application and the issue is accepted on the issues list of the next rate case of each utility?
- Will any other OEB forum deal with SSO terms and conditions, and if so, what is the forum?

Role of the DAR TF

The role of the TF was then raised. Is the role of the DAR (i) restricted to defining rules of access to distribution services, or (ii) also to define the services (i.e., principles underlying the terms and conditions) that are provided by the LDCs and the market will have access to? All members agree that role (i) is within the scope of the DAR, but the broader role implicit in (ii) was disputed.

To resolve the dispute a letter will be sent to the Board on behalf of the DAR Task Force.

- ***George Vegh agreed to draft text explaining why it may be appropriate to take the broader view of the role of the TF.***
- ***Judy and Marcel agreed to draft text explaining why it may be not be appropriate to take the broader view of the role of the TF.***

The TF agreed to proceed while seeking further direction from the Board.

Background Material

Aleck Dadson had agreed to provide some relevant material outlining what has been done regarding access rules in certain US jurisdictions, but was not present. No material has been received by the OEB administrator.

Marcel agreed to provide material on the Georgia experience with unbundling.

Outstanding Issues

No parties were prepared to go further at this time in establishing a process for addressing technical issue related to data transfer. It is acknowledged that this will have to be done, but the process would be separate from the TF.

No parties had any suggestions for utilizing the services of PHB in support of the work of the TF at this time.

2. Committee Reporting

Report of Committee #3

Dwayne provided a summary of the issues addressed in the meeting, based on the draft minutes which have been circulated.

The ensuing discussion identified a follow-up issue for Committee #3:

- Brian Howell suggested that the definition of distribution should be from a delivery point to the customer meter, not from the city gate to the customer meter. The committee will revisit this definition at the next meeting.

Report of Committee #1

Judy provided a summary of the issues addressed in the meeting. The minutes of the meeting are forthcoming.

The meeting focused on the template for SORs (Summary of Recommendations)

Topics discussed included:

- Who qualifies for standard service.
- What functions should be included in standard service.

The next Committee meeting will review the first drafts of several SORs.

Discussion of the report addressed the issue of the direction being taken on who would qualify for SSO. The view that access would be restricted (the safety net concept) was

opposed by Brian Howell for IGUA. It was noted that all ECG customers now have a right to system gas; however, Union does not allow M7 customers to buy system gas.

[Note: At meeting #3 of Committee #1, Marcel clarified that Union permits M7 customers to buy system gas, provided they can supply it without incurring costs above cost of procuring the additional system supply. Hence, marketers have observed that M7 customers have been told they cannot access system supply.]

3. Work Plan

Concern was raised about the need to get the discussion of the remaining issues underway. It was agreed that initial meetings of all additional Committees should be scheduled.

The additional committees are:

- #5: Provision of Consumer Information (linked to Comm. #4)
- #6: Emergency Supply Planning
- #7: Distributor/Retailer Relations (follows Comm. #2 and #3)
- #8: Compliance and Dispute Resolution
- #9: Distribution Connection (linked to Comm. #3)

Progress on the issues related to Committees #6 and #9 were identified as priorities.

A meeting schedule was agreed to. It has been distributed under separate cover.

4. Other Matters

Ron Sewell, representing a Georgia metering firm, would like to present his view of what has been learned from the Georgia experience. Staff will determine its schedule and get more information on the scope of the information he can present to the TF.

Judy Allan is to determine if Scott Campbell can provide background to the first meeting of Committee #6.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch. Thanks to the OEB.

ATTENDANCE
Distribution Access Rule Task Force
Meeting #3 February 16, 2000

Allan, Judy	Enbridge
Davies, Martin	OEB Staff
Goldsilver, Eric	MEU coalition
Brian Howell	IGUA
Litt, Kathi	OEB Staff
Rohit Mehra	Apollo Gas
Quinn, Dwayne	Kitchener
Reghelini, Marcel	Union
Schoenmakers, Jack	OESC
Schumann, Helmuth	MEST
Scully, Peter	ECNG
Todd, John	OEB Facilitator
Vegh, George	CEED
Villanueva, Gerry	Direct

Regrets:

Blake, Bill	NRG
Dadson, Aleck	Enron Canada
Hamilton, Jim	Enbridge
Jones, Elizabeth	TCGS
Petruzella, Nick	Six Nations

Distributor Access Rule Task Force

A G E N D A

February 16, 2000

1. Adopt minutes of January 19 and February 2 meetings
2. Reports from Committees
 1. Committee 3 – liaison Dwayne Quinn
Minutes of February 2 meeting
Further assignments for the Committee (liaison may suggest an agenda for the Task Force to confirm)
Preparation of draft Summary of Recommendations (liaison to confirm that draft SORs may be prepared for voting at next Task Force meeting)
 2. Committee 1 – liaison Judy Allan
Minutes of February 11 meeting (liaison may suggest an agenda for the Task Force to confirm)
Further assignments for the Committee
Preparation of draft Summary of Recommendations (liaison to confirm that draft SORs may be prepared for voting at next Task Force meeting)
3. Work Plan
 1. Scheduling – are we on track for a late April report to the Board?
 2. New Committee(s) – strike a new committee (which can be suspended if the RSC is released before the next Task Force meeting and Committee 2 reconvenes)
 1. Identify
 2. Task Assignment
 3. Membership
 3. The Task Force
 1. Next steps
 2. Task assignments
 3. Schedule
4. Other matters