

MASTER ISSUES LIST - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date	Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Billing	1	Resolved*		02/02/00	Remittance	30			01/27/00
Billing	2	Resolved*		02/02/00	Remittance	31			02/21/01
Billing	3	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	32	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	4	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	33	Resolved*		06/22/00
Billing	5	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	34	Pending		01/27/00
Billing	6	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	35	Resolved*		02/21/01
Billing	7	Resolved*		06/22/00	Policy	36	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	8	Resolved*		02/24/00	Metering	37	Resolved*		04/27/00
Billing	9	Resolved*		02/24/00	Policy	38			01/27/00
Billing	10	Resolved*		03/08/00	Metering	39	Resolved*		10/11/00
Billing	11	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	40	Resolved*		05/18/00
Billing	12	Resolved*		02/02/00	Meter-VEE	41			02/07/01
Billing	13	Resolved*		02/02/00	Remittance	42			02/01/00
Billing	14	Resolved*		02/02/00	Billing	43	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	15	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	44	Resolved*		05/23/00
Billing	16	Resolved*		04/06/00	Metering	45	Resolved*		05/18/00
Billing	17	Resolved*		02/24/00	Policy	46	Resolved*		04/25/00
Billing	18			02/21/01	Policy	47			01/25/00
Billing	19	Resolved*		10/19/00	Policy	48	Resolved*		02/29/00
Billing	20	Resolved*		02/02/00	DASR	49			01/25/00
Billing	21	Resolved*		02/21/01	DASR	50			01/25/00
Billing	22	Resolved*		03/08/00	DASR	51			01/25/00
Billing	23	Resolved*		04/06/00	Policy	52			01/25/00
Billing	24	Resolved*		10/12/00	Metering	53	Resolved*		10/11/00
Meter-VEE	25			02/21/01	Metering	54	Resolved*		10/11/00
Policy	26	Resolved*		02/21/01	Policy	55			01/25/00
Policy	27	Resolved*		02/29/00	Policy	56	Resolved*		02/07/01
Policy	28	Resolved*		02/07/01	Billing	57	Resolved*		02/21/01
Policy	29	Resolved*		02/07/01	Billing	58	Resolved*		10/12/00

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Policy	59	Resolved*		11/1/00
Billing	60			02/07/01
Metering	61			02/07/01
Billing	62	Resolved*		10/26/00
Billing	63	Resolved*		02/07/01
Metering	64	Resolved*		04/13/00
Metering	65	Resolved*		07/20/00
Metering	66	Resolved*		04/27/00
Metering	67	Resolved*		10/11/00
Metering	68	Resolved*		02/17/00
Policy	69	Resolved*		02/21/01
Policy	70	Resolved*		02/21/01
Metering	71			04/27/00
Billing	72	Resolved*		10/12/00
Policy	73	Resolved*		02/07/01
Policy	74	Pending		04/25/00
DASR	75			03/16/00
DASR	76			03/16/00
Policy	77	Resolved*		06/22/00
Policy	78	Pending		07/20/00
Metering	79	Resolved*		02/07/01
Policy	80			06/22/00
Policy	81			06/22/00
Billing	82	Resolved*		10/12/00
Metering	83			07/20/00
Policy	84			02/21/01
Policy	85			07/20/00
Policy	86	Resolved*		02/07/01
Policy	87			10/04/00

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Metering	88	Pending		12/04/00
Policy	89	Resolved*		02/21/01
Metering	90	Resolved*		02/21/01
Metering	91	Resolved*		11/15/00
Policy	92			10/11/00
Policy	93	Resolved*		02/07/01
Metering	94			11/29/00
Metering	95			11/29/00
Billing	96	Pending		11/16/00
		Res.....		
Policy	97			11/01/00
Policy	98	Resolved*		02/21/01
Policy	99			02/21/01
Policy	100			02/21/01
Task Team	101			
Policy	102			
Policy	103			
Policy	104			
Policy	105			
Policy	106			
Task Team	107			02/21/01
Policy	108			02/21/01
Policy	109			02/21/01

***See separate Resolved Issues document**

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
18	For end use customer billing (dual billing situation), ACC Rules are not specific about what the utility and ESPs are obligated to show on their bills. ESP	02/02/00	Billing			02/02/00 In many markets (CA specifically) begin and end meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In Arizona market, utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if ESPs are required to follow same rules. This could apply to all revenue cycle services. 02/24/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) reported on ACC Rules, refer to sections R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. Verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><u>Action:</u> ESPs/UDCs create a proposal for short term solution which may require filing for waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long-term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs: Begin and end reads must be printed on bill according to the Rules. So, these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>03/08/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their company's position in regards to filing waivers. Group will come up with proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>03/14/00 Decision to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, & 56).</p> <p>03/22/00 Proposal: Bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate the bill.</p> <p>10/11/00 – October 4, 2000 Rule tweaking package approved – 1612 changed but not 210 B2. 210 B2 DOES need to be chngd. Shirley will let Barbara Keene know and wait for direction from Staff on how to handle the existing waiver.</p> <p>2/21/01 Barbara Keene had advised the group at a previous</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						meeting that the PSWG might need to submit a new waiver with documentation to support the waiver.		
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads. (PSWG – Billing)	01/26/00	Meter-VEE		See issue 101	<p>01/26/00 Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>02/01/00 What is the utilities responsibility to audit MRSPs? Rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>04/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP - Tony Gilloly, APSES, New West Energy - Janie Mollon, C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP - Greg Carrel, a representative from the Co-ops (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p> <p>06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering subcommittee 10/11/00 – This has previously been assigned to VEE 2/21/01 – This issue will be addressed in the MRSP performance monitoring task team with issue 101.</p>		Open
30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considerations and customer service (for problem resolution and	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		<p>Example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours.</p> <p>All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	cycle time of EDI 824)?							
31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to ESP and payment directly to bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to bank (single path)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		<p>Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to sending parties.</p> <p>2/21/01 –TEP & SRP use a dual path , APS uses a single path. This issue will be discussed more if the future.</p>		Open
38	Will UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes? (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy			<p>(New West Energy - Janie) will clarify at 03/13/00 meeting.</p> <p>Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes.</p> <p>Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide information of all sites (even those not going DA) to customer. If there is no IDR meter at site, customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from UDC and pay associated costs.</p>	3	Open
41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter? "Day of Install" (Day of Removal, issue 103)	01/27/00	Meter-VEE			<p>In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring newly installed meter can be read prior to 1st billing by MRSP or face penalties.</p> <p>02/03/00 (First Point) This is usually done at the meter install time.</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						04/27/00 To be addressed in the VEE sub/subgroup. 2/7/01 – the group clarified that this issue involves both the MSP and the MRSP		
42	Will we require an 824 on all transactions (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data? (PSWG - Policy)	02/01/00	Remittance					Open
47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy			A working group of market participants should study the intent of Commission Rules and make a determination that applies to all UDCs. Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.	2	Open
49	Develop interim business processes that can be im-	01/25/00	DASR			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or UDC to implement a request, as provided by proposed business proc-		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	<p>plemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. Business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in.</p> <p>Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to bundled service. (APSES)</p>					<p>esses. The customer’s choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until out-bound/ in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. To develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. “Customer choice” will become more of a reality.</p>		
50	<p>New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bundled service. (APSES)</p>	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
51	<p>Account Update – Notification of changed account information. UC and PD</p>	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DADR Handbook (APSES)							
52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and UDCs (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		see Issue 34	<p>Process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root cause analysis is complete. Standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible.</p> <p>An example of the California "MADEN" process is attached to the original change control document.</p> <p>Process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs.</p>	3	Open
55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DADR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy			<p>The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as: meter information, submitting Direct Access Service Requests, meter installations or removals, meter reading services, consolidated and/or dual billing, and settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for same service, fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All the various fees provide an additional barrier to development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p>	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						Proposal To develop a viable market in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to be recovered by the UDCs.		
59	Need clarification on estimating rules, specifically section 210-A-5C	02/08/00	Policy			Confusion about load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing? 10/12/00 210 A5c The group believe this issue is for 210 A5 c only. Need to determine if it should be a part of our 210 ...waiver Action Item: Shirley will seek clarification with Staff 10/26/00 210 A5c - per Barbara keene this is a DA cust that isn't load profiled 11/01/00 Assigned to Policy	3	Open
60	According to the Rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	02/08/00	Billing			*Refer to Issue 70	2	Open
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's? What is the performance criteria What is process for commu-	02/08/00	Metering		see Issue 65	06/22/00 Discussion also focused on possible timelines and CUBR has performance standards. Reassigned from Policy to Metering. 0720/00 Issue should refer only to MSPs. (TEP) Position on MSP	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	nicating this information? (PSWG – Billing)					Performance Standards was provided. 2/7/01 – the group confirmed that this issue deals with developing performance monitoring /testing criteria for MSPs 2/07/01 – established a task team to develop – John Wallace – Chair due date 4-01		
71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer prior to switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected. (PSWG – Billing)	02/24/00	Metering			This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process. 04/27/00 Will be reviewed when additional business processes are reviewed.	3	Open
75	On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations. (PSWG – metering)	03/16/00	DASR					Open
76	On DASR – forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR? (PSWG -Metering)	03/16/00	DASR			In step 3 of Metering Business processes, the pending meter owner is also required. Meter owner may change from the time the DASR is submitted to the time the meter is exchanged.		Open
78	There is no language in	03/28/00	Policy	08/07/00		System implications – Will MSP have to submit DASR's?	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	<p>Rules preventing MSP from contracting directly with customers, how should this issue be addressed?</p>					<p>Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 "DASR means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company <i>by the customer's Electric Service Provider load serving entity.</i>"</p> <p>This may force UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. ESP would send DASR but they would not be liable for MSP. Contract would allow UDC to hold MSP liable.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants to assess impacts of MSP contracting directly with customer. Be prepared to discuss your company's position and provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) agrees there is no language in rules that precludes customer contracting directly with MSP. TEP would like to see language added to rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP. (APS) identified contractual and system impacts if customer contracts directly with MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with ESP only. (APSES) leans towards customer not subcontracting directly with MSP. MSPs should work through ESP so customer doesn't end up with a metering system ESP or MRSP cannot read.</p> <p>06/22/00 To be reviewed by ACC staff. Is this within the purview of PSWG? <u>Action:</u> (due 06/30) Participants to submit position papers per 06/22/00 minutes.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>07/04/00 (Marv Buck) provided an overview of how other states are handling. Participants (NWE, APS, TEP, Phaser, SRP, APSES) presented their positions in a consolidated document to the PSWG.</p> <p>07/20/00 Steve Olea presented ACC staff position: Electric Competition rules allow MSPs to contract directly with customers; operating procedures need to be developed. Issue will include only MSPs at this time, but MRSPs will be kept on radar screen. <u>Action</u>: Participants may submit issue sheets, including 1) impact of issue on business processes and 2) any past practices in markets that provide insight to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by 08/07/00.</p>		
80	What are the security and encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data (Barry Scott).	05/09/00	Policy			06/22/00 Priority set at 1.	1	Open
81	What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent (Jim Wonter –APSES)	05/09/00	DASR			06/22/00 Priority set at 3.	3	Open
83	When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve	06/22/00	Metering		see Issue 65, 59, 60, 70, 83, 84	<p>06/22/00 <u>Action</u>: Each entity to provide their solutions on how to handle this issue in July subcommittee meeting.</p> <p>07/20/00 (APS) discussed MRSP Performance Standards at the PSWG mtg. (TEP) Position on MRSP Performance Standards was provided.</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill?					08/16/00 Billing Subgroup is currently addressing.		
84	Is the bill that is issued when a customer switches considered a "final" bill?	07/19/00	Billing			<p>9/28/00 Staff confirmed that the when a customer switches providers or disconnect service, it is a "Final Bill".</p> <p>10/12/00 The group agreed that R14-2-210 A5b should be addressed/modified with the next Rule Tweaking Package - Waiver not needed at this time. Will raise at Policy Group Nov 1</p> <p>10/26/00 this issue covers all of section 5 not just 5b, will raise at Nov 1 Policy mtng</p> <p>2/21/01 – the group agreed that this is resolved because Staff confirmed at a prior meeting that the bill is considered a Final Bill when the customer switches providers. Staff confirmed that by New West Energy's definition of "Customer", that one service point closure would not be a Final Bill. Barbara Keene disagreed and will follow up with Staff and report at the March 7, 2001 meeting before status is updated.</p>		Open
85	Granfathering totalization of meters.	07/20/00	Policy			issue statement unclear		Open
87	Should a customer (w/out a UDC contract) be required to secure a new provider w/in 60 days after returning to Standard Offer?	10/04/00	Policy			APS' Schedule #1 section 3.5 has this requirement		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
92	How do UDCs handle a customer requested disconnect for UDC or ESP? How do we differentiate between a DA customer and Bundled customer? What type of training?	9/13/00				10/11/00 Issue raised by Janie Mollon (NEW) in the metering group – referred to Policy to assign to the appropriate group. – TEP, APS, SRP, AZ Cooperatives Refer the customer to the ESP for DASR submittal to the UDC. Once the DASR is received the UDC will initiate the orders to disconnect the service.		Open
94	What is the timeframe for UDC to exchange the meters to return direct access customers to bundled service	10/25/00	Metering			ESPs want a required timeframe for UDCs to complete the exchange and ret cust to Bundled serv. 10/11/00 New West Energy proposed a 10 working day from the DASR requirement.. UDCs to review and comment at next meeting 10/25/00 The group discussed the issue and agreed to table it until Staff confirms if Standard Offer cust can own meters or not. 11/29/00 – UDC processes have been documented in the Business Rule document. Will address this issue once the market is more established.	2	Open
95	What is the start read for a new meter sets	10/25/00	Metering			10/25/00 Do meter set have to start at zero? Action item: participants will come back to November mtng with positions 11/29-00 – SRP, TEP, APS require DA meters to be set at zero and CUC & SSVEC do not require reads at zero. Pending feedback from other Cooperatives	1	Open
97	D-Star is requiring 10 minute intervals for imbalance settlement,	11/1/00	Policy			11/1/00 FERC is requiring this by 12-15-01 – Unsure on when the PSWG should start addressing this. CA went to 10-min intervals on 8-1-00 and are doing in line interpolation.		Open
99	The use of Electronic Signatures for DA transactions (House Bill 2069)	11/15/00	Policy			11/15/00 The metering group requires a signature for the exch of the EPA form. Since metering is not the only group that this may apply to, it is passed to Policy and will be raised on 12-4-00.		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						2/21/01 – The group added that any request for data would also require a signature.		
100	What process can be developed to facilitate a customer installing an IDR meter and equipment before DA that allows a customer to move to DA and back with the same equipment.	12/4/00	Policy			12/4/00 Action Item: Participants to draft position papers identifying options and send to Evelyn Dryer by January 24, 2001. Evelyn will consolidate position papers and send out prior to the February 7, 2001 meeting.	1	Open
101	MRSP performance monitoring and certification		Task Team			2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Janie Mollon due date 4/04/01		Open
102	Modify 867 to meet VEE rules		Policy			07/20/00 Missing intervals and zero intervals referred to next VEE session.		Open
103	Day of Removal (Day of install issue 41)		Policy			Need to develop a procedure to ensure that when a meter is removed that all data is captured. Develop who is responsible for posting up to what time		Open
104	Develop VEE rules for Non IDR							Open
105	MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.		Policy			2/07/01 Copied from issue 56 to separate the two issues.		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
106	Develop a document showing all agreed upon billing business rules		Task Team		See issue 96			Open
107	Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules					2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Stacy Aguayo due date 3/07/01 2/21/01 – The group reviewed a proposed outline for the Metering Handbook		Open
108	Inconsistency involving transmission and ancillary services as non Competitive in definitions (1601 29) and C - Competitive in Billing elements(1612 O) and tariffs (1606 C2) (ACC Staff)					2/21/01 – Staff is requesting the PSWG develop a recommendation on the issue.		Open
109	New CC&N application needs to be reviewed to verify there are no inconsistencies between what the PSWG has approved. (ACC Staff)					2/21/01 – ACC Staff raised the issue for the group to address Action Item: Ken Grove volunteered to review the MRSP CC&N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting. Action Item: Janet Henry volunteered to review the MSP CC&N requirements and report back at the March 7, 2001 meeting.		Open
110	What is the process to ensure that all meter data is in before the account goes back to bundled service?					2/21/01 (From Metering Business Rule doc.) How does UDC verify with the ESP that all the data is complete? If data is incomplete how does UDC notify ESP? (data from a previous billing cycle not final bill data). This is being referred to VEE as of 9/27/00 but left here to make sure it is covered and does not need to be part of the Bus Rule Doc.		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status