

Subj: **FW: Comments on Subcommittee charters**
Date: 9/4/02 12:15:44 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [Jim](#) Minneman

Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))

FYI

These comments will be presented at today's meeting.
Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara R. Alexander
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 8:13 AM
To: Minneman, James M
Subject: Comments on Subcommittee chartersQ

Jim: I have the following preliminary comments and wonder if you could pass them along to the e-mail list. I will be in the conference call today but thought it might be efficient to get these comments out prior to the call.

Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee:

1. The use of the term "recommendations/standards" should be replaced with the language in the REQ Procedures document that describe the products the REQ will produce.
2. I don't like the references to the WEQ in the first paragraph. This is the REQ and by definition our proposed business practices will relate to state regulation of the LDC and state regulation of suppliers. Any creditworthiness proposals by the REQ will relate to the implications of the transaction for retail customers only. The WEQ will presumably deal with risks to the wholesale market. I don't think the work product of the REQ should be held up or injected into what will be very contentious and lengthy negotiations in the WEQ, which isn't really set up to do anything in the near term anyway. Let's draft the document to focus on REQ implications and then of course of the WEQ later suggests the need for coordination, we can consider that at the time of the request.
3. The Charter should identify the specific topics that will be the subject of the subcommittee's "charge". This then suggests that the UPB Report should be mentioned, referenced, and perhaps identified as the starting point for the subcommittee's work.

Customer Processes Subcommittee:

1. Same comment re "recommendations/standards".
2. I do not agree that the "focus" (first paragraph) of this subcommittee is to develop customer processes that "facilitate entry into and efficient implementation of retail electric markets." Actually, I agree with "efficient implementation"--it is the "facilitate entry into" that I object to. That is a policy loaded objective. The focus should be on the implementation of state policies to ensure uniform and efficient implementation or best practices.
3. I like the list of specific topics in the second paragraph, but again question why no reference to the UPB Report.

Technical Electronic Implementation Subcommittee:

1. I agree with Dave E.'s comment about the reference to "policies" in the first paragraph.
2. I am not sure about the suggestion that NAESB should develop and "over arching technical committee to develop consistent standards throughout all the quadrants." If this is a suggestion that the format and presentation of the standards should have a uniform approach, that is fine with me. If this suggestion means that all of the various quadrants should "one" set of technical electronic standards, I question whether this is either desirable or even possible. Again, this type of approach would cause significant delay in any attempt to unite the technical communication protocols of the REQ and WEQ?

Talk to you all later.

Barbara Alexander
Agent, Maine Public Advocate

The information contained in this message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately, and delete the original message.