Information contained in working group notes represent the views of the individuals participating in the working group only, and in no way reflect official Ontario Energy Board position or opinion.

### Minutes for July 18, 2006 – DRAFTFINAL

	<b>8, 2006</b> ım – 6:00pm
07.002	ιιτι – σ.σο <b>ρ</b> ιτι
Darcy Hewgill	Direct Energy
Karen Cooke	Direct Energy
Avery Rhijnsburger	Enbridge
Katrina McWhirter	Enbridge
Nola Ruzycki	Energy Savings
Tom Stark	ExtenSys
Loraine Baillargeon	Kitchener Utilities
Mark Van Praet	Union Gas
Chris Ripley	Union Gas
Mark Davis	Superior Energy
Omar Silva-Fulchi	Superior Energy
Barb Robertson	OEB

ADMINISTRATION			
Item	Discussion	Action Items	
1. Review Minutes from June 7 2006 and June 12/13 2006	Both minutes were accepted as is		

NEW BUSINESS			
Item	Discussion	Action Items & Prime	
Review of Test     Plan	<ul> <li>Brian Hewson will send a letter to the Advisory Committee requesting their approval of the Test Plan and their certification that their systems will be ready and tested for the start of market testing.</li> <li>Agreed that all would review the test plan and schedule for reasonableness and state clearly any concerns they may have about their readiness.</li> <li>If there is going to be any change in the GDAR schedule, clear reasons will have to be presented to the board why a change is needed.</li> <li>Comments will be required by the end of July</li> </ul>	All to review the test plan and schedule and return comments by the end of July in response to Brian Hewson's letter	
2. Milestones	<ul> <li>Milestones for Test Plan and Test Plan Approval are OK</li> <li>Barb will revise remaining milestones appropriately and send out with these minutes</li> </ul>	Barb to revise remaining milestones appropriately and send out with these minutes	
3. Schemas – v3	<ul> <li>Version 3 of the Schemas were sent out by Mark a week ago, but they are stopped at the OEB firewall</li> <li>Union Gas will continue to upgrade the schemas for now</li> <li>Agreed that we can still add reason codes, enumerated values etc to the schemas, but the schemas should be considered frozen for changes requiring code changes</li> <li>Working Group to review any changes proposed to schemas</li> <li>Next version of schemas to be reviewed at WG meeting on August 3</li> </ul>	All to review version 3 of the Schemas and get comments to Mark before WG meeting Aug 3	
4. Thresholds	<ul> <li>Thresholds are really a Service Agreement item</li> <li>Union and Kitchener will work out wording with Vendors for "soft thresholds" where distributors will call Vendors if threshold exceeded to check whether transaction should go through</li> <li>Enbridge will propose a threshold plan to Vendors and work out wording outside the Working Group.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Union and Kitchener to work out wording for Service Agreement for soft thresholds with Vendors</li> <li>Enbridge to propose threshold plan to Vendors and work out Service Agreement wording</li> </ul>	

5. GST	<ul> <li>Union has received a letter from CRA stating their view, based on wording from the Service Agreement, is that the Distributors are buying the receivables from the Vendors</li> <li>Agreed that each Distributor to add wording to the Service Agreement to state how GST will be handled (this wording will supercede existing wording in the Service Agreement) as long as Vendors agree with the wording</li> <li>Barb to confirm that OK for service agreement to be modified by parties</li> <li>GST not in IRR schema now, but will be added as an optional field</li> <li>Darcy to reflect this in comments to Mark on version 3 of schemas so that change is made for next schema release</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Darcy to comment on addition of GST to IRR in schemas</li> <li>Each distributor to add wording changes to Service Agreement for their preferred method of handling GST</li> <li>Barb to confirm that OK for service agreement to be modified by parties</li> </ul>
6. CCL	<ul> <li>Discussion of values to go in tags</li> <li>For "effective date" – Union will supply move in date, Enbridge will supply move out date (except for overlap scenarios)reflects discussion, but superseded by next bullet point</li> <li>Agreed to change "effective date" to "move out effective date" and "move in effective date" for next release of Schemas</li> <li>Avery to confirm business rules for overlap effective dates including what will be in IRR for a given move type</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Mark (Union) to change         "effective date" to "move out         effective date" and "move in         effective date" for next release         of Schemas</li> <li>Avery to confirm business         rules for overlap effective         dates including what will be         in IRR for a given move type</li> </ul>

7. TOS	<ul> <li>Question of issuing a Status Advice against a TOS after the TOS effective date – agreed that TOS can be updated for 60 days after the effective date for consistency with other transactions</li> <li>Question of whether a TOS can be cancelled with a SA-TTR after the TOS effective date – agreed that TOS can be cancelled for 60 days after the effective date if the TOS has not been completed and the account has not been finalized – after the account is finalized, a ROS or CCL will be used instead.</li> <li>With a pending enroll (accepted but not flowing) if a TOS is issued, the enroll will be implied cancelled (cancelled independently by each party) after the effective date of the TOS. If the TOS is then cancelled, the enroll must be reissued by the Vendor if the enroll is still desired.</li> <li>Pending transfers will survive a TOS and a TOS cancel after the effective date of the TOS.</li> <li>Collision matrix needs to be updated – cells K13, K14, L13 and L14 should be changed to "no change".</li> </ul>	Barb to update Standards document     Mark to update collision matrix
8. SA	<ul> <li>Lead time for updating enroll request should follow the same lead times as the enroll request itself</li> <li>The enroll date can be revised up to 15 days prior to the effective date of the original enroll, but not less than 45 days prior to the new enroll effective date</li> </ul>	Barb to update Standards     Document

9. Drop	<ul> <li>A drop cancel SA-TTR to cancel a STR-Drop that was made by a consumer directly through the distributor can be submitted issued up to 5 days before and 10 days after the effective date of the consumer's drop.</li> <li>For Enbridge, changing the drop requests to a minimum lead time of 15 days instead of 3 days is viewed as a scope change, not a clarification. Enbridge will have to decide whether this can be accommodated for Feb 1 or a later date. A change will be required to the Standards document pending Enbridge's response. If it is not possible for Feb 1, a GIGA should be raised.</li> </ul>	Barb to update Standards     Document if appropriate
10. Canceling a Switch after Contest Period has ended	If a consumer wants to drop to system gas after a contest period has ended, and the consumer tells the winning Vendor, then t was agreed that the cancel will be allowed through the Vendor or Distributor.	Barb to update Standards     Document
11. Pending Transactions	<ul> <li>Question of how many pending transaction are allowed – can have only 3 STRs per Vendor per customer plus SAs, and only 2 Vendors pending at one time – need a reject reason for an extra STR that comes in when 3 are active</li> <li>Lofraine will find out if Kitchener can handle this for the next meeting</li> <li>All should examine the collision matrix to make sure the maximum numbers are reasonable.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>All to examine the collision matrix to make sure the maximum numbers are reasonable</li> <li>NOTE: Aug 3         Loraine advised Kitchener cannot handle; Union and Enbridge can handle an unlimited number.     </li> </ul>

12. Reject Reasons	<ul> <li>If optional transactions are sent, the recipient can reject the optional transactions at the FA level if the Market Participant removes the optional transaction from their own version of the schemas</li> <li>If say a Distributor sends an enroll request transaction (in error) the Vendor will reject using "transaction not supported"</li> </ul>	•
13. Collision Matrix	<ul> <li>Kitchener cannot accommodate I5 and I6 for Feb 1, although Lorraine will recheck this for next meeting</li> <li>Workaround is that if contest is terminated by Vendor B, Vendor A has to resubmit the drop request.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lorraine to confirm that         Kitchener will not be able to accommodate I5 and I6 for Feb 1     </li> <li>NOTE: Aug 3         Loraine confirms Kitchener cannot accommodate     </li> </ul>
14. Standards Document	Barb will update the Standards Document for the August 14 meeting	Barb to update Standards     Document for August 14     meeting
15. July Statement with Cycle Read Dates on first or second day of following month	<ul> <li>Enbridge pointed out that it is possible that a meter read (say for the July bill) may be done on August 1 or 2, and if a switch takes place from Vendor A to B on August 1, then a "month zero" is created for Vendor B (i.e. an IRR will come to Vendor B when the customer was not Vendor B's for July). Vendor B would logically reject the IRR.</li> <li>Vendors are asked to examine whether there is a workaround for "month zero"</li> </ul>	Vendors to examine whether there is a workaround for "month zero"

NEXT MEETING		
Item	Discussion	Lead
Logistics	Date/Times: Thursday, August 3, 2006 – 9:00am to 5:00pm	
	Location: OEB (may be changed to conference call or cancelled based on comments to schemas received by August 1)	
	Date/Times: Monday & Tuesday, August 14/15, 2006 – 9:00am to 5:00pm	
	Location: Offices of EnbridgeOEB – Meeting Room 2402	
Minute Taker	Kitchener Utilities	
Agenda Items	August 3 – Discuss comments to Release 3 of the Schemas	
	• August 14/15	
	Review Standards Document	
	o Data Migration Plan	