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* Roll Call

Utilities:

First Energy, PECO, PPL, Duquesne

Suppliers:

ConEd Solutions, Direct Energy

Service Providers:

Intelometry, ista North America, PPL Solutions

PUC Letter from EDEWG Leadership on WPWG

Leadership approved and is circulated for wet signature. Due to physical locations across the country, the earliest filing with PUC is 2/10 or 2/11

Follow up from 1/22 meeting

* March 2014 deliverable: Joe Bisti (PECO) stressed the importance of a timely response from the PUC relative to the EDEWG letter. Assumptions have been made the PUC will issue a decision by March 1st and it would be in the EDEWG’s favor. Obviously if either does not occur, the March 1st deliverable could be much different than the current approach. Brandon Siegel (Intelometry) stated he would follow up with PUC Staff (Jeff McCracken & Lee Yalcin) and request their assistance in expediting a decision from the Commission.
* The current Solution Framework would be filed on March 1st with a cover letter from the EDEWG leadership detailing the progress, challenges and direction of the WPWG. Stress it’s a living document going forward.
* The WPWG needs a common reference point relative to the differences between the ‘single user’ and the ‘system to system’ models. Joe Bisti of PECO suggested, and the group agreed, for a technical sub-team to develop a technical PowerPoint deck to fit this need. The deck itself will cover how system-to-system is different than user-to-system and how it must change the conversations on various topics. It is likely to include definitions, high-level technical diagrams with explanation, some use cases to illustrate examples, and information on what the available technologies actually provide. It would be used as a reference point moving forward. PECO solicited technical volunteers preferably from each the EDC, EGS, service provider and EDEWG leadership segments. PECO will coordinate with all volunteers and facilitate creation of the deck. The goal would be for this team to share the deck during the March 12 or 19 meeting.
  + Volunteers to date…
    - Joe Bisti, Kyle Jordan (PECO & team) – EDC
    - Brandon Siegel (Intelometry) – Service Provider / EDEWG leadership
    - Sandeep Puskuru – (ConEd Solutions) – EGS
    - FirstEnergy – EDC – name TBD
    - Ista North America – Service Provider – name TBD
* During the 1/22 meeting it was discussed about additional parties having access to the web portal, specifically Conservation Service Providers (CSPs). Joe was concerned these parties have not been active participants in the EDEWG. This is an EDEWG subgroup, and members have asked PUC representation in the past if and how they intended to engage CSPs in this effort given that CSPs have never been connected to EDEWG (nor have they ever had a reason to be). By not informing them of this effort is equivalent to precluding them from access, and PECO believes ensuring CSPs are at minimum informed that is an EDEWG Leadership responsibility in collaboration with the PUC liaisons. Brandon stated the Smart Meter Data order references the CSP entity and precluding their access could result in larger issues as the portals come online. Sue Scheetz (PPL) stated there are CSPs who currently have access to the PPL web portal.
  + Brandon will follow up with PUC Staff relative to PUC licensing of CSPs and if that said license has any customer data stipulations.
  + Assumption is that WPWG is just talking about CSPs in addition to EGSs, and not other unlicensed third party entities.
  + The WPWG must have very clear definitions of the term “CSPs” – PECO is familiar with two interpretations, one as “conservation service provider” (believe is the PUC term – includes energy efficiency) and one as “curtailment service providers” (PJM term – refers to entities providing demand response and load management services).
* The credentials discussion during the 1/22 meeting reversed a previous consensus of one credential per organization. This was mainly in part due to the concern one credential could be shared across tens or hundreds of people within an organization and its vendors / contractors. This could result in unauthorized access should a single party depart the organization. Therefore the preference shifted towards either multiple credentials managed by the EDC or a single ‘super user’ for each organization who would manage/coordinate its users.
  + - PECO is adding the three options to the Solutions Framework and the group will attempt to obtain consensus on which option will be the recommended method.
    - As a side note, the discussion of ‘voting’ was brought up. For the past 14 years the EDEWG has functioned under a consensus type of structure. In the event of non-consensus, there will be documentation made for each ‘side’ of the issue which will be escalated to OCMO for further action. EDEWG has no formal voting process in place, nor any guidelines or direction to do so.
* There were discussions during the 1/22 meeting relative to the overall solution framework and how other states (specifically TX) make smart meter data available. In prior discussions, the WPWG stated such expanded solutions would be a ‘premium service’ possibility above and beyond the core foundation of the solution.
  + Joe Bisti (PECO) stated the EDC mandate is to provide access to the data, per the PUC order. The order does not specify the services associated with “access” – That is for the WPWG to decide.
    - From a utility perspective, providing an EGS (or CSP) with access to the data can be very simple and easily exclude what could be considered “premium” services that involve additional infrastructure investment and ongoing transaction costs – for instance, “subscription services” customized to portal users that would necessitate the EDCs “pushing” some data feed, customized or otherwise, to EGSs/CSPs as opposed to EGSs/CSPs “pulling” (downloading) the data that they have access to in a standard format.  PECO believes the former would be a “premium” service going above and beyond the order’s mandate and that the EDCs should be entitled to consider charging EGSs for such a service, for which the WPWG may need to develop a standard to be used by those who choose to offer it – but not every EDC may choose to offer that service because of its “premium” nature.  (All EDCs should offer what the WPWG decides on as “foundational” services, such as the EGS-pull request/response model that the group has talked about up to this point.)
    - PECO believes that the WPWG as a group needs to attempt to come to consensus in terms of services considered what PECO calls “foundational” versus those PECO calls “premium”. The discussion is largely dependent on how a critical mass of EGSs and CSPs anticipate strategically and tactically using the data they will have access to and the capabilities/requirements they would have in order to do so. (Given participation level in WPWG and Brandon’s comments that this simply isn’t known yet by the marketplace, PECO sees achieving critical mass as a key WPWG challenge.)
    - Brandon Siegel (Intelometry) stated he has been contacted by EGS and service providers who are concerned about the direction of the WPWG and the proposed solutions. Concerns were focused on the need for system to system processing; meter level vs account level detail and potential daily file limitations. The state of the industry in 3-5 years when the portal solutions are fully live across the State could be coherently different than today. The group should think more outside the box as interval detail data (historical & daily usage) may very well be the normal in 3 years. There could be thousands of requests per day for smart meter data and the solutions being vetted currently are not in support of the perceived high demand for smart meter data. By going down the current path, the State of Pennsylvania would deploy outdated technology in 3 years while other states have widely available smart meter data today. Brandon agrees the WPWG must make the determination relative to the foundation based on the input from the EGS and CSP community.
* Next Steps:

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

Next meetings:

February 12th @ 2:30pm

February 19th @ 2:30pm

February 26th @ 2:30pm

March 5th  @ 2:30pm
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