

DRAFT Summary of 2006 Loss Factor Meeting Notes and Actions, 2005-01-28.

Westin Hotel, Nakiska Room. 8:00-15:00

Item	Issue/Date	Discussion	Action/Timeline	Status
1	CEA Data Book, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders wanted to know the basis of ICBF used in the Stacking Order. ICBF is defined by CEA in their 'Annual Report on Generation Equipment Status'. The report is part of CEA's Equipment Reliability Information System.	AESO suggests that the use of CEA data in the to dispatch generation for the power flows is appropriate	Not Started.
2	Inter-Tie LF, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders wanted to know that when multiple transaction are occurring on the tie-line - who will pay for the incremental loss amount in the proposed Inter Tie LF and what are the LFs going to be?	Since there is no existing priority ranking or curtailment for interchange transactions, AESO proposes all parties involved in the Inter-Tie transactions will pay the same based on the equation of the LF curve.	
3	Export Double Charging, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders want satisfaction they are not being charged for both their generator and the Inter Tie transaction for export opportunities.	AESO will propose a method where the Inter Tie LF will reflect the losses caused by the Inter Tie transaction alone.	proposal by 2005-02-08
4	Maintenance/Turn Around Information, 2005-01-28	Because of confidentiality of the information stakeholders wanted to know more about the inclusion of turn around of the generators in the base case modeling.	AESO will respect stakeholder request that the use of aggregate information based on fuel type based on MSA information is appropriate for 1 year LFs. Further details to be provided	Response by 2005-02-08
5	ISD Modeling, 2005-01-28	Teshmont proposed different modeling scheme for ISDs in order to reduce the complexity of LF calculation. For ISDs, only NTG amount is considered in the calculation but losses also occur in the BHF network too.	[Need to confirm that ISDs are accountable for losses in their system and which allows AESO to create equivalent load and generator models for ISDs.]	
6	Compression, 2005-01-28	First report with stakeholders. It was identified that the recommended compression algorithm was not strictly consistent with the regulation. The group discussed and agreed that this was not a major problem.	AESO recommends the adoption of the 'clipping with linear compression algorithm' compression technique recommended by Teshmont	

7	2010 LF Results, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders expressed that they would have more satisfaction and comfort once they will receive the LF numbers calculated for the year 2010	AESO has given the 2010 planning base case (WP and SP) to Teshmont for LF calculation.	
8	Flow Tracking Method, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders wanted to document the conclusion that the Flow Tracking Method was not an appropriate LF methodology in Alberta.	Teshmont will provide the documentation to AESO	ASAP
9	Transparency on Stakeholders' comment/opinion, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders wanted to see response to their specific concerns with more clarity.	To be included in future responses [This document should identify the stakeholder asking the question]	
10	Signoff on Parts 1/2 of the Methodology, 2005-01-28	AESO would like signoff from Stakeholders on the proposed methodology. Signoff is required so AESO can move on with the project development. (TCE - ok after 2010 results, flow tracking answer; Alta Gas - ok after 2010 results; Calpine - would like discussion with AESO before signing off; TAU - ok with methodology but wants 2010 results, Syncrude - wants ISD info and would like AESO discussion; ATCO - would like AESO discussion, ok with Parts 2/3; ENMAX ok with methodology	AESO to produce 2010 loss factors by February 8 to show stability in the LF's. Stakeholders would agree to the process pending the 2010 results. Other actions to be addressed ASAP	Signoff by 2005-02-08
11	LF Term, 2005-01-28	Accuracy favors the shorter term. Stakeholders wish to know the potential impacts to loss factors is a longer time horizon	AESO understands from the discussion that stakeholders would be happy with 1 year term and a non-binding projected set of loss factors 5 years from the current year factor	Forecast of 2010 by 2005-0-8
12	Battle River LF, 2005-01-28	Battle River generators have different loss factors in the Teshmont study. Stakeholders wanted AESO to have a closer look to find the cause.	The units are connected to two different buses.	

13	Net Zero / Counter Flow , 2005-01-28	Stakeholders have concern about the loss charges when there is zero flow across the border but export transactions from both sides of the border. Concern that asymmetrical loss factors result in a mismatch during equal counter flows. The net schedule flow determines the actual losses on the system	AESO to propose issue (either in a paper or in the Rules discussion paper) on the treatment of multiple users with counter flows on the tie and corresponding loss factor treatment	proposal by 2005-02-08
14	DOS Calculation of Loss Factors, 2005-01-28	issue raised regarding the treatment of DOS customers for loss factors	DOS customers will be charged or credited loss factors as per the Regulation	proposal by 2005-02-08
15	Calibration Factor, 2005-01-28	role of the calibration factor for loss factors in 2006	AESO will outline the application of the calibration factor in the 2006 GTA	GTA filed Feb 1, 2005
16	Rule Discussion Paper and process, 2005-1-28	in order to facilitate the rule process for Loss Factors, stakeholders wish to have clarity and avenues of input	AESO will issue a discussion paper, draft, on the rules including the items addressed in the issue papers.	proposal by 2005-02-08
17	Treatment of Merchant Transmission lines wrt Loss Factors, 2005-01-28	Merchant lines within or connecting to control areas outside of Alberta need to be considered in the application of loss factors. A tariff solution may be required.	The existing issue paper - or - the new rules discussion paper will outline further options for consistent treatment of merchant lines.	proposal by 2005-02-08
18	Treatment of new Generation - or - decommissioned generation, 2005-01-28	For new generators, will a recalculation take place mid-year for loss factors and how to deal with generation developed quickly? (i.e. inter-year)	The addition of new generators should not require mid year recalculations - the new generator should be in place already for the year in question and if the ISD is different than the proposed in-service date, the calibration factor should reflect the difference	propose issue is closed
19	Data Verification, 2005-01-28	Stakeholders wanted to have more comfort around the use of proper data and assumptions in the LF calculation and be able to verify it.	AESO will propose that stakeholder input be included when deciding generator values for the base cases	As needed
20	Next Meeting	AESO wishes feedback for the next and subsequent meetings on the 2006 loss factor process	AESO proposes Feb 18,2005 for feedback and February 24, 2005 for the next meeting.	

21	Method of Communication to Stakeholders, 2005-01-28	Communication of the progress on the loss factors and relevant information needs to be shared with this group and the stakeholder industry at large.	AESO will produce communications and information and: a) send to the core group, and b) make available weekly to the stakeholder community	ongoing
22	Historic metering data	No concerns were raised regarding use of historic data. One response clarified that appropriate adjustments must be made for forecasted load growth and for changing market conditions.	AESO's response is that the generic stacking order is used to accommodate load growth and that historic data be used to reflect changes in both market behavior for both energy and ancillary services, specifically provision of operating reserves. Generators will be provided with opportunity to indicate to AESO that their market behavior will change significantly in the future.	
23	New Generation	All responses were supportive of using information on new generators to be added. One concern was expressed that only generators with signed CCA agreements should be included. An enhancement was suggested to use the best available forecast of operating characteristics for new generators.	The AESO accepts both suggestions.	
24	Generator Outage information	All responses indicated a desire to retain confidentiality around individual generator outage information but agreed that outage information aggregated by fuel type or location was satisfactory	The AESO will respect the desire.	
25	Transmission system additions	All responses supported use of transmission system additions in the loss factor model.	The AESO concurs..	