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Roll Call

Utilities:

First Energy, PECO, PPL, Duquesne

Suppliers:

ConEd Solutions, First Energy Solutions, Constellation, Champion Energy, AEP Energy, Suez Energy

Service Providers:

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

PUC Questions Regarding CSP participation

Sue/PPL read the PUC response to our outstanding questions:

#1-Are they required to obtain licensing from the PUC?

CSPs are registered. The PUC maintains a CSP registry. They are not required to be EGS licensed.

#2-What laws protect the customer info is its compromised via misuse from CSPs

If the CSP is contracted with an EDCs to do Act 129 work, our regulation over the EDC and the principal/agent relationship between the EDC and CSP would give us the ability to act.

If the CSP is acquiring usage info from the EDC in the capacity as and EGS than the CSP must have been licensed as an EGS, and consequently, our authority over EGS actions would give us the ability to act.

PUC would recommend licensure. The PUC has authority to penalize EGSs for fraudulent operations. If the CSP wants access, they get a license, and they therefore give the PUC authority to prosecute them in the event that they handle info fraudulently. If they share account numbers we can go after them because they are an EGS.

#3-Can the WPWG recommend a solutions framework in which CSPs are not part of and expect the Commission accept?

I’d recommend stating that CSPs can obtain an EGS license if they want to use the Web Portal, and consequently, they do not have to be kept out.

Consumer protection is paramount. Plus, we give bonding reductions for brokers/marketers. It is possible for Staff to consider an even further reduction for CSPs who have interest in gathering info from EDCs and consequently seek EGS licensure, but I’ll obviously leave that up to you.

Solution Framework Document Review

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

1. Section 2.3.3
	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.

1. Section 2.3.4
	1. Historical Summary and Interval data would be as billed.

PPL would provide billed for summary but VEE’d for interval. This statement is not accurate for PPL

PECO would be billed.

Duquesne and First Energy didn’t know.

* 1. One version of data would be provided – consensus
1. Section 2.3.5
	1. PPL would provide VEE’d data within 48 hours

PECO performs a VEE “light” and would not be comfortable with 48 hours

Duquesne and First Energy didn’t know.

* 1. Same as a) above.
	2. One version of the data will be provided – consensus.
1. Section 2.3.6 Data Elements
	1. Consensus reach on the data elements provided.
	2. Consensus reached that account level data will be provided initially with eventual meter level data. Brandon will be asked to provide next week an explanation of the business value of meter level data.
	3. Discussion regarding PPL’s inclusion of a meter multiplier value. PECO to internally discuss.
	4. Precision of interval data will be the same as EDI.
	5. On Peak and Off Peak data not provided was agreed to as a consensus item.
2. Section 2.3.7 Response Times
	1. EDCs are not able to respond at this time. It is expected the working group will flush this out when discussing user to system vs. system to system access.

Next Meetings:

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

Next meetings:

February 26th @ 2:30pm

March 5th  @ 2:30pm

March 12th @ 2:30pm
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