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Roll Call

Utilities:

First Energy, PECO, PPL, Duquesne

Suppliers:

ConEd Solutions, Direct Energy, First Energy Solutions, Constellation, NRG, Champion Energy, AEP Energy, Direct Energy

Service Providers:

Intelometry, ista North America, PPL Solutions, Energy Services Group, Big Data Energy Services

PUC Letter from EDEWG Leadership on WPWG

Leadership has completed the wet signature process. PUC Staff was in the process of filing the letter on 2/11/14.

PUC Staff participation in the WPWG

During Thursday’s EDEWG meeting, PUC Staff stated they’re short staffed and will be unable to commit to regular participating on EDEWG sub-group meetings. Leadership stated they would communicate items to Staff should the need arise to do so.

Technical Sub-team

PECO is working on setting up the initial meeting of the WPWG technical sub-team. The first meeting should occur within the next week. The team will begin development on the technical deck to be delivered to the WPWG by March 19th. Parties wishing to participate should contact Joe Bisti and Kyle Jordan.

Solution Framework Document Review

The group resumed reviewing the Solution Framework document (PECO DRAFT 2-7-14) distributed in the meeting agenda

1. Section 2.1.1.c.iii.1.a – adds two options for including CSPs.
   1. Create new eligibility process – create new CSP list and maintain
   2. Modify PUC EGS license process – create new less burdensome process within the current EGS License process and use the existing PUC eligibility process.

The group agreed to define CSP within the realm of the document, PECO to add to next document revision.

On 2/6, Brandon met with PUC Staff inquiring into the existing process at the Commission relative to CSP licensing. Staff response remains pending.

1. Section 2.1.2.c.iii – adds three options for access credentials
   1. EGS/CSP Level Credentials
   2. Individual Level Credentials
   3. Administrator Capabilities

The group discussed the options and decided the EDCs need to check internally with regards to any audit processes. PPL stated option 2 is more in line with their audit and each user has the ability to reset their own password reducing resource constraints. The majority of the group leaned towards options 2 and 3.

1. Section 2.3.2.c – specific list of standard rejection reasons

The group stated existing EDI reject reasons would be used as the template. PPL stated they were able to expand on reject reasons in their portal to give the user additional description of the rejection. In the event the user required additional clarification, they would need to follow the same protocol as EDI and contact the utility supplier support directly.

1. Section 2.3.3
   1. Data format – no consensus, various parties spoke and formats of Excel, CSV, Green Button/XML were mentioned as preferences.
   2. Data delivery – files pushed to user or placed in location for download. No consensus.

Relative to specific data format and delivery, the point was made the group these should be defined by transaction (HI & IU) and then again by SU-MR and StS options. The technical sub-team will likely address some of these areas in the effort.

Next Meetings:

**\*\*The WPWG will meet weekly until further notice\*\***

Next meetings:

February 19th @ 2:30pm

February 26th @ 2:30pm

March 5th  @ 2:30pm

March 12th @ 2:30pm

Conference Bridge:

888-238-2971

Access Code: 2203616