	Summary of 2006 Loss Factor Meeting Notes and Actions, 2005-03-08, and 2005-03-17/18.			
		AESO Main Board Room. 1	2:00-14:00 (2005-03-08)	
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.
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 has completed a methodology where imports and exports are set to zero to calculate domestic generator loss factors. Then, based on work by Teshmont showing all losses are reasonably recovered, a single import or export value is used to recover losses due to inter-tie transactions. Double counting does not occur using this methodology.	2005-04-12 – AESO suggests using this method.
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 received comments that using next years generation maintenance information is not acceptable. Therefore, AESO will use historical generation levels only including past maintenance.	2005-04-12 – AESO will not use next year's maintenance information.
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.	2005-02-24 – AESO reviewing all ISD's and determining method of treatment.	Status update by 2005-03-08. Update 2005-03-08: Delayed until March 31 2005.
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	AESO recommends the adoption of the 'clipping with linear compression algorithm' compression technique recommended by Teshmont	Status 2005-04-12: DOE to review the request and provide clarification.

		not a major problem.	2005-04-12 – in order to be compliant with the regulation, AESO will send a clarification letter to the DOE to seek changes to the regulation regarding compression.	
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. TCE has requested AESO to further review the method and rank it,	Teshmont has reviewed Flow Tracking and recommended it is not suitable for Alberta. Please see correspondence from April 1 and April 6 2005.	2005-04-12 – Flow Tracking will not be recommended.
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. All questions will be responded to on the AESO Web site and circulated to the core group.	2005-02-24 – Ongoing 2005-04- 12: believe this item is same as #21, and suggest #9 be removed
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 2005-04-12 – all parties except for ATCO, Maxim, and Calpine, have agreed with the methodology. AESO has answered questions on methodologies posed by stakeholders. Teshmont still recommends the 50% Area Load Adjustment Methodology.	Status 2005-03-08: Continue to request signoff from stakeholders as per 2005-03-09 letter. Update 2005-04-12: AESO proceeding with recommended methodology, 50% Area Load Methodology.
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  2005-02-24 – in order to validate information, stakeholders would like the	As needed. Data requirement determination to be made by mid March 2005.

			model, when available, to review. Data may be reviewed and signed off by owner in reasonable period of time so cases may be developed. Heat rate and outages still seen as confidential.	Update 2005-03-08: Data request sample to be made by AESO for comment.
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 be made for forecasted load growth and for changing market conditions.	AESO will use historic data from the previous twelve months to calculate the next year's loss factors. The generator data will be shared with owners for confirmation of volumes.	2005-04-12: AESO is presently examining data to determine 12 base cases for review.
	1	New items, 2005-0		
26	Regulation interpretation for 22(2), 2005-02-24	AltaGas raised the issue that in 22(2) of the Regulation, only charges are envisioned in the context of the inter-ties.	AESO has drafted a letter for the DOE including interpretation of 22(2).	Status 2005-03-08 and 2005-04-12: The DOE has accepted issue as takeaway and will respond.
		New items, 2005-0	3-08	
28	Methodology comparison – 2005 to 2006 and discussion on Average versus Marginal calculations. 2005-03-08	<ul> <li>Request to compare 2005 to 2006 results</li> <li>Request to show new methodology is an average calculation</li> </ul>	Please refer to AESO's letter 2005-03-09	2005-04-12 – issue complete
29	Transmission Must Run 2005-03-08	Request was made to remove TMR from the GSO when calculating loss factors	AESO has drafted a letter for the DOE to clarify TMR issue. AESO recommends using TMR only to the levels required in the base cases.	2005-04-12 – DOE will clarify.
30	Phase in or Transition to new loss factors, 2005-03- 08	Requests were made by two companies to phase in changes in loss factors to the new values	2005-04-12 – AESO has drafted a letter to the DOE for input on this item. AESO has also offered a transition plan subject to group consensus.	2005-04-12: AESO will respond to group with details on how much the

				plan will affect those who pay. Two plans being reviewed: AESO and HR Milner.
31	Calibration and loss factor sample calculation	A request has been made to show, based on the 2005-02-24 meeting, a sample calculation for the calibration and loss factor.	AESO will provide a basis for the calculations and show an annual reconciliation plan	2005-04-12: ongoing.
	March 17 (	AESO offices) and 18 (TCE Offices) 2005 Tech	nnical Session with Bob Burton, Teshmont	
33	Maintenance Proposal, 2005-03-17 (received by email)	Stakeholder (EPCOR) is not in favor of either AESO proposal on maintenance.	AESO requests alternative proposals by March 23 in order to finalize the outcome.	2005-04-12 – please see item #4.
35	Two bus model, AESO representation and Stakeholder response, 2005-03-17	Stakeholders responded to the March 16 2005 2 bus model representation by AESO. Some stakeholders believe the 2 bus representation is not accurate	ATCO responded with a four bus model which was reviewed by AESO's consultant.	2005-04-12 - please see April 1 and April 6 AESO correspondence.
36	Two bus model, AESO representation and Stakeholder response, 2005-03-18	Stakeholders responded to the March 16 2005 2 bus model representation by AESO. Some stakeholders believe the 2 bus representation is not accurate	Stakeholders to prepare a model for Teshmont to rank as per the other methods by March 23, 2005	2005-04-12 - please see April 1 and April 6 AESO correspondence.
37	Import and Export representation, 2005-03-18	Some participants still believe the exporters are paying twice for loss factors on exports.	AESO to release V-3 of the loss factors again based on some level of import and export.	Ongoing
		oril 12 2005, 9:00-12:00 (Marriott Hotel, Acadia		
38	Clarification letter to DOE	Several items require clarification or at least notification to the DOE regarding the application of the Rule via the Regulation.	AESO is sending a letter on these items to the DOE.	Letter to be sent the week of April 18.
39	Rule Status	The Rule was presented to the group with input from the discussion paper and the formal consultation process.	An item was raised indicating if AESO adds a position to the Rule not supported by the Regulation, the Rule would be open to appeal.	2005-04-12 – AESO will seek clarification and Regulation changes before making Rule decisions.
40	Curve fitting for Data on Generation Levels	AESO has developed a method to extract and interpret data to reflect generation	Please comment to the initiative dated 2005-04-11	Ongoing

levels in the base cases.	

## Legend:

- Yellow Highlighting means item has been completed, and will be removed from the next version of notes.
- Bolding means item is incomplete and has been updated with new information.
- Action list includes submissions from 2005-01-28, 2005-02-24, 2005-03-08, 2005-03-17/18, and **2005-04-12.**