

**North American Energy Standards Board
Retail Electric Quadrant Teleconference**

Wednesday, June 05, 2002

1. Welcome

- > The Meeting convened on Wednesday, June 5, 2002 at 12:11 p.m.
- > Antitrust guidelines were reviewed and participants were cautioned to avoid anticompetitive behaviors.
- > Changes in the agenda were suggested by Mr. Sappenfield pertaining to the discussion of a joint task force to work with the RGQ. The agenda was adopted with these changes.
- > The draft minutes from the May 29, 2002 call were adopted as written.

2. Segment Elections

Mr. Minneman notified the participants that the ballots for the REQ segment elections are due in today (Jun 5, 2002) at the end of business (5:00 p.m. CST).

3. Annual Plan

Mr. Minneman informed participants that the REQ would like to have a draft of the annual plan ready to be voted on by next week's (Thursday, June 13, 2002) meeting, and to present this version of the annual plan to the EC for its endorsement. The plan would then be presented to the Board at the end of the month.

A short discussion followed during which Ms. Khan gave a brief review of each workpaper provided for the meeting ("Annual Plan External Comments Matrix", the annual plan with modified quarter completion dates, and the "Proposed Re-prioritization of REQ Annual Plan Items 6/4/02").

The new schedule for the annual plan was discussed and it was agreed that the original schedule was aggressive and that as long as work begins right away on the plan that a one quarter delay will not hamper the quadrant's progress. Also, the delay may give the RGQ a chance to catch up and make coordination with that quadrant more feasible. The general consensus in the subcommittee was that the most important items on the plan should be addressed first even if they take longer.

Mr. Cody suggested that the REQ should define business processes then deal with EDI.

Ms. Kiselewich suggested that the plan contain start and completion dates for the different items. Mr. Ackerman responded that it might not be feasible to include such

detailed dates because of possible future modifications. He then suggested that the REQ allow the process to “run its course” until the EC is seated.

>Item 11

Ms. Khan began discussion by noting that there had been confusion regarding what the EDM item addresses (ref. to comments made by Ms. Hess and Mr. Koogler).

Ms. Hess recommended that adding a combination of hers and Mr. Koogler’s comments might be a good way of resolving this issue. She indicated that she wanted to include the part of Mr. Koogler’s comment that states: “...exchange data, including but not limited to: transactional data interchange, websites, and bulletin boards.” It was agreed that this was a good idea and that the suggestion would be sent to the subcommittee.

It was also noted that the GISB (NAESB) standards for EDM are only one possible model for data transport, and that the REQ should also look at the UIG and be aware of any developments in the FERC concerning a standard IT platform.

>Other Items

Ms. Khan informed participants that comments contributed by EnCana, Rochester Gas & Electric and the Pennsylvania PUC will be sent to the subcommittee for consideration.

Mr. Minneman stated that comment 7a needed some further clarification (ref. Pennsylvania PUC comment). Mr. Ackerman then informed the group that the words that were deleted from that comment now appear in a position that “allows them to line up with the UBP documents.” Mr. Minneman indicated that this was okay and that the Commissions suggestion to separate item seven into two separate items is fine.

Mr. Barkas then suggested that Creditworthiness should be at the top along with supplier licensing because these two issues are related and that customer information (currently number 8) should also be moved up in the priorities list. Several participants noted the importance of customer information in regards to the supplier side. Mr. Ackerman then noted that prior to this meeting, the committee had not received much feedback concerning the importance of customer information, and therefore the consensus was that it fit nicely in the middle of the list. Mr. Minneman suggested switching customer information and customer inquiries.

Ms. Khan then gave a summary of this proposed change:

- Customer information to be moved into the third quarter (item 6)
- Customer inquiries to be moved into the fourth quarter (item 8)

Mr. Koogler then inquired whether the group was comfortable with the new schedule being delayed into 2004. The group agreed that as long as work started immediately, the extension of the plan into 2004 produced no serious problems.

Ms. Khan reviewed the changes that have been agreed upon by the group.

-refine and clarify item 11

-Switch items 6 and 8

-Correct spelling error

4. REQ/RGQ Coordination (Item added to agenda by Mr. Sappenfield)

Mr. Sappenfield informed participants that the RGQ is doing an inventory of best practices throughout different states and utilities. He suggested that this creates a difference in priorities in similar categories in RGQ and REQ plan. It was agreed in the RGQ meeting that they would support a joint task force in order to coordinate the priorities of the RGQ with the REQ as much as possible. He suggested having members of the REQ (people who participated in RE annual plan) look at the two plans to see if they can be reconciled in consistency, priorities and categories.

Ms. Alexander responded that there was a general feeling among the RGQ that they wanted to get their annual plan in shape before fully engaging with the REQ, but that they were certainly willing to cooperate. It was agreed to inform the RGQ committee that the REQ also wishes to coordinate annual plans with them. Mr. Minneman pointed out that with the formation of the REQ, and election of REQ officers, responsibility for the annual plan will now switch to the REQ Executive Committee. Ms. Khan and Ms. Kiselewich agreed to contact Mr. Zavodnick about any possible near-term opportunities to coordinate.

5. Meeting Coordination Task Force (Update)

Mr. Buccigross gave an update on the MCTF in which he outlined the committee's plans to integrate software modifications so that chairs can have access to calendars to add meeting dates and times etc. He reiterated the MCTF's desire to be a short-lived committee that will present recommendations to the EC for acceptance.

Note -- An update sent in by Steve Zavodnick, the committee chair, subsequent to the meeting included the following information: The status of the Meeting Coordination Task Force (MCTF) is that the draft minutes of the May 24 conference call are available on the NAESB website. The next conference call is June 18 at 2p. Call details and agenda to follow. I expect no changes in status before the June 18 conference call. All REQ members are invited and encouraged to review the draft minutes along with the proposal attached to the minutes. All REQ participants are invited to join the conference call or send comments electronically to both myself (steven.m.zavodnick@bge.com) and the NAESB office (naesb6@aol.com). To access the draft minutes, click on committees listed on the left hand bar of the home page, click on Executive Committee, then look for the May 24 meeting date and select draft minutes.

6. Recruitment Status

Ms. Parks had no updates on new participants. She informed participants that additional information had been sent out.

7. Status of Action Items from Previous Meetings

> Supplier Segment Membership

Mr. Minneman reviewed the topic of supplier segment membership, stating that in discussions with Ms. McQuade (NAESB), the consensus from a NAESB standpoint is that this is a supplier segment issue and should be handled within that segment. He was not able to arrange a meeting with members of the supplier segment. Ms. Hess volunteered to take the lead on the issue within the supplier segment to facilitate its being resolved.

Ms. Hess then informed participants that she is arranging a conference call scheduled for Monday, June 10, 2002 from 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. (CST).

It was decided not to continue the discussion of this issue at the quadrant level.

Ms. Hess reminded participants that the supplier segment meeting is an open meeting and information concerning this meeting will be posted on the website.

> Future Quadrant Meetings

Mr. Minneman informed participants that an EC meeting will be held next Thursday, June 13, 2002 where REQ officers will be seated. He also stated that the function of the subcommittee from that point forward would be the responsibility of the EC.

There is another call scheduled for this group on Wednesday, June 19, 2002.

8. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

Attendees

Eric Acherman	EEI
Barbara Alexander	Main OPA
Jeff Anthony	Wisconsin Electric Power Company
Bill Barkas	Dominion Retail
Jim Buccigross	8760 Inc.
Andy Burnham	Consumers Energy
Greg Buttress	Southern Company
Bill Bourbonnais	Wisconsin Public Service
Yvette Camp	Southern Company
Eric Cody	National Grid USA
Jay Costen	Counsel for NAESB
Dorman Davis	Mississippi Power
Richard Dodd	Mississippi Power
Michael Garret	Georgia Power Company
Theresa Hess	Reliant Energy Retail Services
Mark Jarret	Southern Company Services
Misty Khan	Telerox
Tom Kilgore	Gulf Power
Ruth Kiselewich	PG & E
David Koogler	Dominion Virginia Power
Pat Kylie	We Energies
Meghan McMillan	NAESB
Jim Minneman	PPLSolutions
Terry Moran	Public Service Electric & Gas
Rich Muzikar	Consolidated Edison
Stacy Parks	Structure Group
Judy Ray	Alabama Power Company
Tom Ringenbach	American Electric Power Company
Lisa Robert	Defense Energy Support Center
Bob Rosenthal	PA PUC
John Russom	Alabama Power Company
Keith Sappenfield	EnCana Energy Services
Mark Scheel	Dynegy
Chip Soil	Exxon Energy Delivery
Ed Tucker	Duke Power
Eric Wilen	NY State Electric & Gas