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Mr. David M. Blank
Manager - Rate Department
FirstEnergy Corp.
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308
November 9, 2000
Dear Mr. Blank:
This letter confirms our arrangements to apply certain agreed-upon procedures to the Customer Accounts (or Contracts) (as defined in the attached Exhibit I) for the purpose of assisting FirstEnergy Corp. (the Company) in connection with its review of Supplier Claims (as defined in the attached Exhibit I) for Market Support Generation (MSG) in accordance with the Protocol outlined by FirstEnergy Corp. for the suppliers.

We understand that the lists of irregular and valid Customer Accounts from which we will be working are the responsibility of FirstEnergy Corp. and thus the integrity of such lists are the responsibility of the Company. We also understand that the Company's ultimate objective is to determine the validity of the Suppliers' Claims in accordance with the Protocol outlined by FirstEnergy Corp. for the suppliers. Achieving that objective is also the responsibility of the Company.

## Andersen's Responsibilities and Limitations

The objective of our work is to provide you with a summary of our work, describing our procedures and findings. Our engagement will be performed in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Our work cannot be relied upon to disclose errors, fraud or illegal acts that may exist and which might have been detected had we performed an audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Pursuant to professional standards, in the unusual event that we are unable to complete our work, we may decline to issue a summary of our work or a written report, if so requested. If you request a written report, we expect such a report to be similar to the draft attached to this letter.

The procedures we are to perform are set forth in the attached Exhibit I and have been agreed to by FirstEnergy Corp. The responsibility for determining the sufficiency of the procedures for their purposes is solely the responsibility of the Company and the specified employees of the Company that will use our work.

Our procedures and findings will not constitute a legal determination of the suppliers' compliance with the requirements of the Protocol. In addition, we will make no representations regarding questions of legal interpretation of the provisions contained within the Customer Contracts (as defined in the attached Exhibit I).


Mr. David M. Blank
November 9, 2000
Page 1

If you request a written report, our report will state that (1) the sufficiency of those procedures is solely the responsibility of FirstEnergy Corp. and that we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of those procedures for your or the users' purposes, (2) the procedures do not constitute an audit (or examination) in accordance with professional standards and had we been engaged to perform additional procedures or an audit (or examination) in accordance with professional standards, matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported and (3) it is restricted to the parties named therein and may not be used or referred to for any other purpose.

In addition, if you request a written report, our report will state that our procedures and findings do not constitute a legal determination of the suppliers' compliance with the requirements of the Protocol. Our report will also state that we make no representations regarding questions of legal interpretation of the provisions contained within the Customer Contracts (as defined in the attached Exhibit l).

Our work is not designed to detect whether any systems are Year 2000 compliant nor to assess the potential impact of the Year 2000 issue on the lists of irregular and valid Customer Accounts from which we will be working. Further, we have no responsibility with regard to the Company's efforts to make its systems, or any other systems (such as those of the Company's vendors, service providers or any other third parties), Year 2000 compliant or provide assurance on whether the Company has addressed or will be able to address all of the affected systems on a timely basis. This is the responsibility of management.

The working papers prepared in conjunction with our work are the property of our Firm, constitute confidential and proprietary information, and will be retained by us in accordance with our Finn's policies and procedures.

Should circumstances arise that prevent us from completing the agreed-upon procedures, we will so notify you so that alternative arrangements can be made and so that you will have an opportunity to consider whether you wish us to perform any additional procedures. We are not currently aware of such circumstances.

## Management's Responsibjlities and Representations

The management of the Company is responsible for making available to us all records and related information and personnel with information of relevance to our engagement.

> Mr. David M. Blank
> November 9, 2000
> Page 2
> We will require a representation letter from FirstEnergy Corp. concerning the completeness and accuracy of the lists of irregular and valid Customer Accounts from which we will be working. Because of the importance of management's representations to our work. FirstEnergy Corp. agrees to release Arthur Andersen LLP and its personnel from any liability and costs relating to our services under this letter attributable to any misrepresentations by management.

## Fees and Billing Arrangements

Our fees will be based upon the experience levels and time required to complete our work, plus out-of-pocket expenses. This estimate assumes we will receive appropriate assistance from your staff in the preparation of schedules and other matters. Interim billings will be submitted as the work progresses, and a final bill will be submitted following the delivery of our summaries of. findings (or written report, if so requested). Billings are payable upon receipt.

Except to the extent finally determined to have resulted from Arthur Andersen LLP's (Andersen) gross negligence or willful misconduct: (1) Andersen's maximum liability to FirstEnergy Corp. for any reason, including Andersen's negligence, relating to the services under this letter shall be limited to the fees paid to Andersen for the services or work product giving rise to liability and (2) FirstEnergy Corp. will indemnify and hold hamless Andersen and its personnel from any claims, liabilities, costs and expenses arising for any reason, including Andersen's negligence, relating to the services under this letter.

Neither party to this arrangement letter will assign, transfer or sell, directly or indirectly, to any third person, any claims against the other party arising out of this arrangement letter.

This arrangement letter reflects the entire agreement between the Company and Andersen relating to the services covered by this letter. It replaces and supersedes any previous proposals, correspondence and understandings, whether written or oral. The agreements of the Company and Andersen contained in this arrangement letter shall survive the completion or termination of this arrangement letter.

## Acknowledgement

Please confirm your agreement with the foregoing by signing a copy of this letter and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Mr. David M. Blank
November 9, 2000
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We are pleased to have this opportunity to be of service to you and assure you that this engagement will be given our close attention.

Very truly yours,

## Agreed and acknowledged:

FirstEnergy Corp.
By
Date
David M. Blank, Manager - Rate Department

WORK: MSG Supplier Claims Review
DATE: $\quad$ November 9,2000

DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE COMPLETED
WORK COMPLEIED

The work you have engaged us to perform in accordance with our job arrangement letter with you, dated November 9, 2000, is outlined below. We understand that FirstEnergy has reviewed the MSG Supplier Claims (as defined below) for duplicate, ineligible, invalid and/or inactive Customer Accounts (or Contracts, as defined below) within and amongst each Supplier Claim. FirstEnergy's definitions of duplicate, ineligible, invalid and inactive Customer Accounts are attached hereto for reference purposes. In performing its review, FirstEnergy segregated each Supplier Claim into two lists - the believed irregular Customer Accounts and the believed valid Customer Accounts. The believed irregularities consist of the ineligible, invalid and/or inactive Customer Accounts identified by FirstEnergy. These lists will be presented directly to the suppliers for resolution. Arthur Andersen will review the believed valid Customer Accounts (which include the duplicates) based on the following work program.

Supplier Claim - A supplier's request for available generation capacity submitted in accordance with the Protocol outlined by FirstEnergy for the suppliers. A claim may contain up to 10,000 customer accounts/contracts (as defined below), all of which must be "claiming" capacity for the same duration.

Customer Account (or Contract) - An individual customer account (or contract) that is included in a Supplier Claim.

1. For each Supplier Claim, obtain from FirstEnergy the listings of the believed irregular Customer Accounts and the believed valid Customer Accounts.
2. For each Customer Account on the listings of the believed valid Customer Accounts, obtain from the supplier access to the related written, signed contract between the supplier and the customer. For the contracts tested in steps 3. and 4. below, ensure the contracts are signed by both parties.
3. In connection with step 4. below, review the terms of the Customer Contracts and identify all provisions within the Customer Contracts that may bear upon the determination that the supplier has a contract (or alternative form of verification consistent with the verification required by the PUCO for CRES certification) with the retail customer as of the date that the Supplier's Claim was made. In performing this review, be alert for provisions within the Customer Contracts that may indicate that the Customer Contracts are not legal, binding commitments (a committed capacity sale). For instance, if executory provisions, or a "letter of intent" or "option" to negotiate or enter
into a contract, are provided for in the Customer Contracts. Document the location(s) of such provision(s) within the Customer Contracts and document the concern(s) with such provision(s).

Based on our discussions with you, it is our understanding that in performing the above, Customer Contracts that are conditioned solely upon the approval for receipt of MSG or non-MSG capacity shall be considered legal binding contracts unless the Customer Contracts contain other provisions that may call into question the legal commitment.
4. Review the listing of believed valid Customer Accounts and compare for consistency the following information on the listing to the related written contracts between the supplier and the customers.
A. Customer account number
B. Customer name
C. Service address
D. Type of customer/generation claimed (residential vs. non-residential and MSG vs. non-MSG)
E. Duration (period)

Continue to compare for consistency the information regarding the Customer Contracts on the listing of believed valid Customer Accounts to the related written contracts between the supplier and the customer until either:
> - Customer Contracts within the following scopes have been reviewed

- All Customer Contracts with capacity claims equal to or greater than $1,000 \mathrm{~kW}$,
- $33 \%$ of Customer Contracts (systematically selected) with capacity claims equal to or greater than 200 but less than 1,000 kW , and
- 10\% of Customer Contracts (systematically selected)


## AGREED PON PROCEDURES WORK PP GRAM

WORK: MSG Supplier Claims Review DATE: $\quad$ November 9, 2000


- For claims in the "other retail" category (i.e., non-residential), upon consideration of the review results for the Customer Contracts reviewed in steps 3 . and 4., it can be determined that the supplier does not have written contracts for at least $5 \%$ of the total quantity of generation capacity claimed in the Supplier Claim containing those Customer Contracts.

5. Prepare a summary of the results of our work.
6. Report to FirstEnergy the results of our work.
7. Draft a representation letter regarding the procedures that have been agreed upon and obtain a signed copy from FirstEnergy.

Procedures for Testing Municipal Aggregator Claims - added December 19, 2000 based on discussions with FirstEnergy Corp. during the weeks of December 11, 2000 and December 18, 2000

1. For each 2. Municipal Aggregator, obtain from such aggregator documentation giving the Municipal Aggregator the right to act as an aggregator (i.e., city ordinances, election results verifying voter approval, etc.).
2. For each Municipal Aggregator, obtain an understanding of the process such aggregator undertook in order to identify the city residents that were sent marketing materials and opt-out mailing(s). Review such marketing materials and opt-out mailings.
3. For each Municipal Aggregator, obtain the opt-out period.
4. If the MSG related to a municipal aggregation program was claimed by a supplier (versus the city itself), review the contract between the supplier and the city as outlined in step \#3 at the top.
5. For each 7. municipal aggregation claim, obtain from FirstEnergy the listings of the believed irregular Customer Accounts and the believed valid Customer Accounts.
6. For each 9. Municipal Aggregator, obtain access to the opt-out forms returned by the city residents/businesses. Systematically select a sample from such opt-out cards in order to test at least $3 \%$ of the opt-out card population.
7. For each opt-out form selected via the systematic selection, review the listings obtained from FirstEnergy (in step \#5 directly above) of the believed irregular Customer Accounts and the believed valid Customer Accounts in order to determine if the account(s) identified on such opt-out forms were properly excluded from the related municipal aggregation claim(s).
8. Prepare a summary of the results of our work.
9. Report to FirstEnergy the results of our work.






## MSG CLAIM ERRORS

## INVALID ACCOUNT NUMBER

DEFINITION - FirstEnergy is unable to match the account number submitted by the supplier with an account number contained in the FirstEnergy CIS records.

## INACTIVE CUSTOMER STATUS

DEFINITION - the account number (per FirstEnergy CIS records) included in a supplier's claim is coded as "Inactive". Inactive means that FirstEnergy is no longer issuing a bill for this account number because the customer has discontinued service.

## INELIGIBLE CUSTOMER ACCOUNT FOR CLAIM

DEFINITION - a residential account that is included in a claim that a supplier has submitted in the Other Retail claim pool; or a non-residential account contained in a claim submitted in the Residential claim pool.

## DUPLICATE ACCOUNT DETECTED

DEFINITION - accounts having the same account number (per FirstEnergy Customer Information System records) that are included more than once in the same claim or in more than one claim for the same time period. Claims may be by the same supplier or from different suppliers. The MSG/Non-MSG categorization is ignored in making this determination.
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## Mahorn, Jeanne A.

From: Janine.Migden@enron.com
Sent: $\quad$ Tuesday, April 10, 2001 4:32 PM
To:
Kahn, Benita A.
Subject:
MSG second round review

_- Forwarded by Janine Migden/NA/Enron on 04/10/2001 03:30 PM -
denise.r.dinie@us.arthuran
dersen.com To: nschwart@enron.com
cc: jmigden@enron.com
01/08/2001 12:44 PM Subject: MSG second round review

Hi Nicole!
Hope all is well. I have completed most of my second round reviews of the MSG
claims and have just a few follow up questions/actions for you.
In reviewing the contract with :., I noted that the customer signed the contract on 11/17/00 (as per the signature page). The claim for this customer was submitted on 11/9/00, which leads me to believe that Enron believed it had established some sort of a customer relationship with this customer prior to 11/9/00. What support do you have to verify that some sort of a supplier-customer relationship was established before 11/9/00 between Enron


In reviewing the contract with i., I noted that the signature page had
been entirely redacted, including the signature. Would you please fax to me the
signature page. Please send the fax to 216-774-6850.
I have attached below an error report and a duplicate report for the Enron claims reviewed during this second round. My understanding is that the errors
are now appearing on the FirstEnergy MSG website on a daily basis. As a result,
you may have already corrected many (or all) of the errors. In order to facilitate the approval process, you may want to double check the attached error
list to ensure all errors that require (required) attention have either
been
corrected or canceled. I also understand that the website DOES NOT flag duplicates. Thus, the duplicates in the attached list still need to be
resolved. Please keep in mind that duplicates can occur in one of two ways

- $\mathbf{a n}$ account submitted twice by the same supplier, either in the same claim number or
in different claim numbers OR an account submitted by two different suppliers.
If the duplicate is due to you submitting an account number twice, it would facilitate things for you to cancel one of the submissions of that particular record. If the duplicate is due to another supplier claiming the same account as Enron, you will be contacted in the near future with further information.

Please fet me know if you have further questions. Thanksl

## Denise

(See attached file: definitions of errors.doc) (See attached file: ENR error accts in claims.xis) (See attached file: ENR dup accts in claims.xis) *Internet Email Confidentiality Footer

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of
the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone.
In such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by
reply email. Please advise immediately if you or your employer do not consent to
Internet email for messages of this kind. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of my
firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.
(See attached file: definitions of errors.doc)
(See attached file: ENR error accts in claims.xls)
(See attached file: ENR dup accts in claims.xis)
DUPLICATE ACCOUNT CLAMMS



November 9, 2000
Dear Certified Electric Retail Supplier:
You have submitted a claim to FirstEnergy Corp. for Market Support Generation made avallable pursuant to the Stipulation and Recommendation approved in the Opinion and Order of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on July 19, 2000, in Case No. 99-1212. EL-ETP.

Consistent with the Protocol for First-Come-First-Served Claims for Market Support and Non-Market Support Generation ("Protocol"), FirstEnergy is implementing the Approval Process set out in Section 6 of the Protocol, including the verification of the existence of a contract and the confirmation of the relevant parameters (account number, customer identification, duration and size of load) identlfied in the Protocol. To effect this process, FirstEnergy has engaged its independent outside auditor, Arthur Andersen, to audit and review the retail contracts that support your MSG claim.

The dates avallable to conduct the audit process are November 14 through November 17, and November 20. You should contact Ms. Denise Dinie at Arthur Andersen directly (216-348-2759) to schedule the time for this audit activity and make other necessary arrangements. The schedule for auditing will be established on a "first-come-firstserved" basis with respect to the order in which the auditor is contacted to make arrangements. To the extent that the documents or other materials required for the audit are located outside the State of Ohio, you will be responsible for the auditor's expenses incurred for travel (including meals and lodging if required). To the extent that audit activity occurs within the State, no audit-related expense will be assessed.

At the commencement of the audit process, the auditor will provide you with a list that reflects any apparent irregularities or deficiencies in the claims that have been identified upon preliminary review by FirstEnergy. With respect to claims identified on the list, you have an opportunity to remedy some or all of these items consistent with the procedures outlined in Section 6.b. of the Protocol. To the extent that you are able to remedy ouch items, they will then be subject to the review process by the auditor. Please direct any questions on this "deficiencies list" to Doug Burnell, Supplier Services Administrator at FirstEnergy, at 330-437-1301. Receipt of this list from the auditor constilutes the start of the five-day period identified in Section 6.b.(iil) of the Protocol.

With respect to any individual customer claims not so identified on the "deficiencies list", the auditor will then commence the review process. The auditor will determine appropriate selection and review processes in conducting the audit.


Your cooperation in the audit process is required. If the auditor is unable to verify the existence of a customer contract or confirm the other parameters referenced above, this circumstance will, consistent with Section 6.b. of the Protocol (note especially subsection (vii)), result in forfeiture of the supplier's place in the queve for a portion of the claim or rejection of the claim in its entirety.

This letter is being dellyered via e-mail and Federal Express to the identified contact for each supplier who has made a claim pursuant to the Protocol.

Your cooperation with the above is appreciated.


David M. Blank

Manager, Rate Department

## Mahorn, Jeanne A.

From: Janine.Migden@enron.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2001 4:43 PM
To:
Subject:
_- Forwarded by Janine Migden/NA/Enron on 04/10/2001 03:42 PM --.
denise.r.dinle@us.arthuran
dersen.com To: jmigden@enron.com, nschwar@@enron.com cc:
01/30/2001 05:42 PM Subject: Re: FE MSG fourth round reviews

## Hi!

I have attached a message that is going to all suppliers regarding the next round of contract reviews applicable to them. The contracts I will need for
this review are listed in the attached message. Should you have any questions, please give me a call.

Thanks in advance for your assistance!
Denise
(See attached file: ENR fourth round.doc)
*********n***internet Email Confidentiality Footer**************

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you
are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone.
In such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by
reply email. Please advise immediately if you or your employer do not consent to
Internet email for messages of this kind. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of my
firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.
(See attached file: ENR fourth round.doc)

## FIRSTENERGY CORP. MSG CLAIMS CUSTOMER CONTRACTS NOT SUBJECT TO THE INTTIAL REVIEW PROCESS

Due to the MSG claims that contain the customers listed below being submitted after the commencement of the initial MSG claims review process, the following customer contracts were not subjected to the initial claims review process. Also, due to some cancelations of contracts that fell before these claims in the queues, these claims are now high enough in the queues to subject them to the review process. As a result, I am providing you with this list so that you may prepare these customer contracts for review.

In order to perform this review in the most efficient and effective manner, to the extent possible, I have been asked to complete the work by way of phone, fax, e-mail and overnight mail. In order to do this, I am requesting that you prepare partially redacted copies of your contracts with the following customers and send them to the fax number that delivers directly to my e-mail (216-774-6850) or by way of overnight delivery to my office (Denise Dinie, Arthur Andersen LLP, Suite 1800, 200 Public Square, Cleveland, Ohio 44114).

In preparing your partially redacted contracts, it is important that you leave at least the provision numbers (paragraph numbers) and provision titles (paragraph headers) in the contracts UNREDACTED. This information is pertinent to my understanding of the types of provisions that are included in these contracts. If upon review of the partially redacted information I determine that additional follow-up is required with you in order to understand certain provisions of the contracts, I will contact you. In addition, please be sure to include the signed signature page(s) as well as any attachment(s) to the contracts that identify the specifics of the contracts, such as the locations covered and/or the pricing arrangements. Lastly, I will need electronic copies of your ASCII files that were uploaded to the FirstEnergy website for the claims listed below.

After completion of this process, upon written request, I will be happy to return and/or destroy any and all contract copies that you have provided to me in order to complete this review. Should you have any questions, please give me a call at 216-348-2759. Thanks in advance for your assistance.
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```
T0: vespolil@firstenergycorp.com, korkosza@firstenergycorp.com, greenrefirstenergycorp.com,
    dinicolar@firstenargycorp.com, rainese(%) firstenergycorp.com
cc: marshr@firstenergycorp.com, Denise R. Dinie
Date: 12/21/2000 11:05 PM
From: dmblank@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Allocated MSG
```

The attached table shows the summary of Market Support Generation claims approved or subject to approval pending PUCO certification/FE registration as of December 21, 2000.
(See attached file: MSG summary 12-21-2000.xls)
No Market Support Generation has been approved for FirstEnergy Services as a result of the length of the queves.

We continue to work toward approval of pending CEI residential claims--that pool is oversubscribed and to fill the remainder of the CEI and TE "other" categories from the first-come-first-served queue. Toledo Edison residential is largely unclaimed at this point; aggregators are working to make claims for cities in that area. Ohio Edison residential still has some MSG capacity avallable.
4. ${ }^{2}$ - MSG summary 12-21-2000.xis

[^0]Market Support Generatton
confidentlal-not for disclosure
Allocated Cialms as of December 21, 2000

Yo: Denise R. Dinie
cc:
Date: 12/21/2000 11:06 PM
From: dmblank (firstenergycorp.com
Subject: msg approvals

## Forwarded by David M. Blank/CE/FirstEnergy on

12/21/2000 10:37 PM
12/21/2000 10:57 PM
David M. Blank

## To: Douglas S. Bumell/FirstEnergy @FirstEnergy, Marc J. Vaccaro/OE/FirstEnergy © FirstEnergy, David M. Headings/FirstEnergy@FirstEnergy <br> cc: Ronald I. GreenFirstEnergy ©irstEnergy, Arthur E. <br> Korkosz/FirstEnergy@FirstEnergy, <br> Subject: msg approvals

the clains identified in the attachment should be approved, as shown
(See attached fle: MSG claims 12-21-2000.xis)

The following attachment shows the surnmary of approved claims
(See attached file: MSG summary 12-21-2000.xis)

Doug: due to the hour, I have not contacted suppliers. Please do so in the morning. Thanks. $D$.
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| TOL | Approved claims $=\Rightarrow$ | Company | Clalm <br> Number |  | MW sured at ner meter) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TE | 176 | for | 8.485 |  |  |
|  |  | TE | 189 |  | 0.78 |  |  |
|  |  | TE | 187 |  | 8.689 |  |  |
|  | TE $\quad$ sutotal $\quad 2191$ (partal) $\quad 18.832$ (a portion of this claim is over the MW limits and will remain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| CompanyClaim <br> NumberMW <br> (measured at <br> customer meter) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R E D A C T E D$ |  |
| $R E D A C T E D$ |  |
| CompanyClaim <br> NumberMW <br> (measured at <br> customer meter) |  |
| $R E D A C T E D$ |  |
| Approval subject to FE Registratlon, PUCO certification and auditor verfication of locations | subsequent claims subject to auditor review MW values subject to review |


$0002-12-2!$ qup
MSG claims 12-21-2000.xls
Market Support Generation
Market Support claims as of 12－21－2000
Approved

redacted
subject to revlew of Error report and PIP customers subsequent claims subject to auditor review
MW values subject to review
Allocated Claims as of December 21, 2000



Industrial Ënorgy Users
KED \& city of Toledo
Redacked key to surpliers
Total allocated
Total avallable
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Market Support Generation

Summary of claim review with D. Dinie 11-11-2001
previously approved approve approve (note) approve (dull) approve (note) approve (dur approve approve

approve
approve approve approve: approve : approve approve approve approve approve (dup) approve approve ... ${ }^{\text {n }}$
 approve

pending
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PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED DURING AUDIT
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C:IWINDOWSITEMPY(Blank list 03-30.xisJAudit Problems


## Arthur Andersen

ABA

To: dirblank © firstenergycorp.com
c:
Date: 10/30/2000 03:40 PM
From: Denise R. Dinie, Cleveland, 781 / 2759
Subject: MSG program

Hi Daval
Hope you had a nice weekendl I wanted to touch base with you to see what your schedule looked like for this week. I was hoping we could get together regarding the work program for the procedures you would like AA to perform on the MSG reserves. Please let me know your avallability and whether you have heard anything further on the status or timing. I have several conference calls and meetngs scheduled for this week but I also have several openings in my agenda.

Also, thank you for the background documents that were provided to me by your secretary. They were heipful. As others become available, such as internal Auditing's documentation and your lists of those companies that have requested reserves, along with your concems, please forward them to me so we may be prepared at any time.

Thanks!
Denise

[^1]
confidential

| To: | Denise R. Dinie |
| :--- | :--- |
| cc: |  |
| Date: | 10/30/2000 03:37 PM |
| From: | dmblank@firstenergycorp.com |
| Subject: | Re: MSG program |

Denise: I left a message earlier. I am avallable Tues after 10 am. We have some more information and timing ideas. Please give me a call.

[^2]


To:
cc:
Date: 10/31/2000 02:01 PM
From: dmblank@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Fe: MSG program

Denise: see the attached file and definitions
(See attacined file: MSG Audit process 10-30-00.doc)

## PROPOSED HANDLING OF MSG CLAIM "ERRORS" DRAFT 10/31/00

## 1 DUPLICATE CLAIMS DETECTED

DEFINITION - claims from a single supplier for the same time period having identical accounts leach claim has the same number of accounts and the account numbers per FE CIS records are duplicated in the claims). The MSG/Non-MSG categorization is ignored for purposes of identifying duplicate claims.
ACTION ? If ail of the duplicate claims are of one category (MSG / Non-MSG) FE will accept the first claim in the queue and cancel all subsequent claims. In the event the claims are in different categories, the supplier will be notified and given the opportunity to notify FE of which claim to cancel.

## 2 DŪPLICATE ACCOUNT ALREADY ON CLAIM or

 ACCOUNT ALREADY ON APPROVED CLAIM DEFINITION ? accounts having the same account number (per FE CIS records) that ars included more than once in the same claim or in more than one claim from a single supplier for the same time period. The MSG/Non-MSG categorization is ignored in making this determination. ACTION ? FE will accept the first occurrence of the account number in a claim. If a single supplier includes the account number in more than one claim for the same time period, the occurrence in the first claim in the queve will be accepted. FE will cancel all other duplicate accounts from claims.

DEFINITION ? FE is unable to match the account number submitted by the supplier with an account number contained in the FE CIS records. ACTION ? The supplier will have the opportunity to either correct the account number or cancel it from the claim. In correcting the account number, the supplier shall identify both the original account and its corrected account number. In no instance shall the requested capacity for the corrected account number exceed the capacity requested for the original account number.

## INACTIVE CUSTOMER STATUS

DEFINITION - the account number (per FE CIS records) included in a supplier's claim is coded as "Inactive". ACTION ? The supplier will have the opportunity to either correct the account number or cancel it from the claim. In correcting the account number, the supplier shall identify both the original account and its corrected account number. In no instance shall the requested capacity for the corrected account number exceed the capacity requested for the original account number.

## 5 ineligible customer account for claim

 DEFINITION 7 a residential account that is included in a claim that a supplier has submitted in the Other Retail claim pool; or a non-residential account contained in a claim submitted in the Residential claim pool.ACTION ? After checking and correcting (if necessary) the account numbers to ensure that they are the right ones for the intended customer, the supplier will have the opportunity to either frise inove the account into the correct claim pool (preserving their place in the queue) or cancel the account from the claim. If an account number is corrected, the supplier shall identify both the original account and its corrected account number. In no instance shall the requested capacity for the corrected account number exceed the capacity requested for the original account number.

UNDER CLAIMED LOAD FOLLOWING ACCOUNT DEFINITION ? an account which a supplier includes in a claim for which the Load Following option has been selected having a requested capacity less than the highest historic peak as defined in the Protocol.
ACTION $?$ FE will notify the supplier to change the option for the account to the Capacity Factor option or to cancel the account from the claim.


- MSG Audit process 10-30-00.doc

[^3]The Protocol states in Section 6 a. (iv):

The Company's approval process includes:
(iv) determination that the supplier has a contract (or an alternative form of verification) ${ }^{8}$ with the retail customer that has a duration at least as long as the duration of the claim for MSG capacity non-MSG line losses. ${ }^{\text {. }}$
${ }^{8}$ Such alternative to be consistent with the verification required by the PUCO for CRES certification
${ }^{9}$ The utirity shall verify the contract temn by reviewing that provision in the Generation Service Agreement or alternate verification form, of through appropriate auditing techniques.

The following process will be used to determine whether such a contract exists:

1. A supplier will have the opportunity to submit an affidavit stating the name of the customer, the account number, the fact that an enforceable binding contract exists between the supplier and the customer, and the duration of the term for which generation service shall be supplied.
2. Upon receipt of such affidavit, the company has the right to audit selected contracts, as follows:

- All contracts for which MSG or non-MSG capacity has been claimed in excess of $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ will be audited
- Between $10 \%$ and $25 \%$ of contracts for-which MSG or non-MSG capacity has been claimed between 1,000 and $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ will be audited, based upon a random sampla
- Between $1 \%$ and $5 \%$ of contracts for which MSG or nor-MSG capacity has been claimed in amounts less than $1,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ will be audited, based upon a random sample.

3. The facts to be audited include:

- Customer name and account number
- Magnitude of MSG or non-MSG claimed
- Duration of the term for which generation service shall be supplied
- The fact of a binding contract between the parties. A contract conditioned upon approval of MSG or non-MSG capacity, with no further conditions, shall be considered binding unless otherwise shown not to be binding. A contract conditioned upon the performance of other executory events as of the date of the claim will not be considered binding.

4. Should the Company identify irregularities in the claiming process, or should the Company receive information leading it to reasonably believe no binding contract exists, the Company may modify these procedures to require a review of all contracts for the information listed in item 3.
5. 

To: Denise R. Dinle
cc:
Date: 10/26/2000 01:01 PM
From: davisneffrstenergycorp.com
Subject. MSG Presentation

Here are some attachments Dave thought you'd like to see. Let me know it there is anything else you need.
(See attached file: Bumell Presentation.ppt) (See attached file: MSG Demo -10-02-00.ppt) (See attached file: MSG Validation Criteria.doc)(See attached file: MSG_10_02_DMB.ppt)(See attached file: Protocol for MSG 0925 $00 \mathrm{mod} . d o c)($ See attached file: Protocol for MSG $100500 . \mathrm{doc}$ )

- Burnell Presentation.ppt
- MSG Demo -10-02-00.ppt
- MSG Validation Crtteria.doc
- MSG_10_02_DMB.ppt
- Protocol for MSG 0925 00mod.doc
- Protocol for MSG $100500 . \mathrm{doc}$
e2001 Arthur Andersen. AB Rights Resenved. For Intemal Use only. Denise R. Dinle
October 2, 2000

Market Support Generation: FirstEnergy Registration
- Three Phase approach due to circumstances related to deregulation in
Ohio.
- Phase I
- Credit Summary Form and supporting credit information
- FirstEnergy Market Based Rate Tariff
- Supplier Rate Schedule (necessary for EDI testing for consolidated bill)
- Copy of application to PUCO or copy of license issued by PUCO ..

[^4]Market Support Generation: FirstEnergy Registration

- EDI Testing

[^5]Market Support Generation: FirstEnergy Registration

- Phase III (To occur in the latter half of the fourth quarter of this year as
documents are available.)

t
Market Support Generation: Notifications
- Upon verification against FirstEnergy Customer Information System,
we will contact you regarding discrepancies or errors.
- You will have within the allotted time frame to respond with corrections.
(Please refer to Section 6.b)
- Upon verification of the entire claim, the Supplier. will be contacted to
inform them that their claim is to be approved pending their execution
of the applicable Service Agreement (Please see footnote 10)

[^6]Market Support Generation: Password Assignment

[^7]FirstEnergy Supplier Services Center: - SupplierSupport@firstenergycorp.com - (330) 437-1323

Marc Vaccaro
October 2, 2000
MSG: Suggested System Requirements
Web application will work with any HTML 3.2 compliant browser.
Suggested Web browsers:

- Internet Explorer v3.02 or above.
- Netscape Navigator v3.0 or above.
Operating Systems:
- Any operating systems should work with the MSG application. Desktop Settings:
- Recommended $1024 \times 768$ pixels for best resolution.
Recommended that site be accessed through a high-speed web connection.
Requires software to create tab-delimited text files for uploading customer data roduct.
FIIS
MSG: The Generation Commitment Pool
This "claim pool" is composed of the following data elements:
- the operating company (either OE, CEI, or TE)
- the customer category (either Residential or Other)
- the claim type (either MSG or non-MSG with line losses).
MSG: Overview of MSG Application
2). Upload associated Customer data to the Claim record through the web
application.
3). When Claim is finalized, submit the Claim to FirstEnergy for approval.
4). Review the Claim List window periodically to determine the current
status of your Claim (i.e. has it been approved, were errors detected,
...).


4
Four basic steps to the MSG process:
1). Create the Claim record through the web application. application.
2).
3).
DRAFT
MSG: MW Calculations
For each "pool", the application displays the following values (in MW):

- Remaining = Total Offered $-\Sigma$ (Approved)
the total offered amount of generation minus tie total amount of generation on
previously approved claims.
Unclaimed = Total Offered $-\Sigma$ (Approved) $-\Sigma$ (Pending)
the Remaining generation minus the amount of generation on pending
(submitted but not yet approved) claims. This is "what is left to claim" if all
Pending claims become approved.
DRAFT
MSG: Data Relationships
MSG Data Relationships:
- A claim is related to one and only one generation commitment pool (if
this was incorrectly entered by supplier, the claim must be cancelled
and re-entered in the correct pool)
- Each claim is for a single duration (for all of the associated customers)
- A claim submitted to FE for approval must contain one or more
customers (i.e. FE will not approve a claim with no customers)
MSG: Claim Data
Claims are comprised of the following required data elements:
- the generation commitment pool (operating company, the customer
category (Residential or Other), and the claim type (MSG or non-MSG
with line losses)
- the supplier identifier (an internal 3 character code that uniquely
identifies the supplier)
the claim period (start and end dates).

MSG: Claim States
A claim may reside in any of the following conditional states:
- New - created by supplier, but not submitted to FE for validation
Reserved - supplier has made a reservation for power with no supporting
customer contract data (only for residential customers)
Pending - claim has been submitted to FE for validation
Verified - claim has been verified by FE (e.g. passed all FE validation
checks)
DRAFT
MSG: Customer Contract Data (Upload File Format)
The web application provides the functionality to upload up to 10,000 customers per
claim.
These Customer upload files should be contain the following four required data
columns in the following order:
(A) - FE customer account number (character field (15))
(B) - customer name (character field (30))
(C) - account type (character field (1) - either Load Following or Capacity Factor)
(D) - requested kW (numeric - max = 999,999.99 kW or 9,999.99 MW)
[for all Residential and other Retail customers with demand meters, multiple kWh
by .00494 to determine this value]
DRAFT

MSG: Creating the Customer Contract Upload File


DRAFT

| MSG: Customer Contract Upload Data (continued) |
| :--- |
| Customer contracts must be imported into the web application from a |
| tab-delimited text file in this format. Extraneous columns will be |
| ignored (beyond the required four columns). Extraneous rows will |
| cause the import to fail. |
| System initially executes basic validation rules upon creation (namely |
| that the import file is correctly formatted, the account number format is |
| appropriate for the associated operating company, all required fields |
| are present, no extraneous rows, etc...) |
| Each customer is validated against FirstEnergy's Customer |
| Information System (CIS) data when the claim is to be verified, not |
| when it is initially upload to the database. |

MSG: Claim Vialidation Criteria

- Please review the handout provided for a detailed list of the
FirstEnergy Validation Criteria associated to this MSG process.
- This Word document lists the initial validation performed during the
upload process and the more-detailed validation that occurs against
the CIS file once the claim has been submitted for approval.
MSG: Additionally Functionality

MSG - Claim List Page (Example)

DRAFT
(Example)
Errors Processing MSG: Validation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| MSG: Summary |
| :--- |
| The roll-out date is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, October 19, |
| 2000. |
| - The web site will be located at www.firstenergycorp.com/msg. |
| - Contact FirstEnergy by sending an e-mail to |
| SupplierSuppori@FirstEnergyCorp.com. |




Requirements

[^8]Market Support Generation:

- Purpose of Meeting
- Description of Protocol
- Administration and System Requirements
- Technical overview
- Q/A
Market Support Generation: Guidelines
- Claimant must be marketer, broker or aggregator
- eligibility
Based on Stipulation Documents
- Based on Stipulation Documents
- Claimant must be marketer, broker or aggregator
- eligibility
- First-come-first-served basis
- Committed capacity sales to OE/CEI/TE customers
- must have committed sale to make a claim

| Market Support Generation: Eligibility |
| :--- |
| - Non-affiliated (with Ohio investor-owned utility) |
| - apply for CRES certification |
| - apply for FE registration |
| - Affiliated |
| $\quad$ - apply for CRES certification and FE registration |
| - make capacity available in service area OR |
| $\quad$ - no owned or leased capacity within one wheeling transaction |
| - Government Aggregator |
| $\quad$ - enact authorizing ordinance |
| $\quad$ - complete opt-out procedure |
| Customer Aggregator |
| - must become eligible supplier |

Market Support Generation
Generation Commitment Pools

$\begin{aligned} \text { - } & \text { Password available to eligible supplier that has applied for CRES } \\ & \text { certification and FE registration and has supplied supplier contact } \\ & \text { information } \\ \text { - } & \text { Suppliers are encouraged to seek password before gate opens } \\ \text { - } & \text { Contact Doug Burnell for information 330-384-4813 }\end{aligned}$

Market Support Generation: Making a Claim

| - Submit claim electronically <br> - Password required <br> - Password available to eligible supplier that has applied for CRES certification and FE registration and has supplied supplier contact information <br> - Suppliers are encouraged to seek password before gate opens <br> - Contact Doug Burnell for information 330-384-4813 |
| :---: |
| - Gate scheduled to open Thursday, October 19 |
| - Each claim must include: <br> - only one of the 12 generation commitment pools <br> - single duration for all customers in claim <br> - limit of 10,000 customers per claim |

Submit claim electronically

- Password required
MSG:
Claimfor "Other Retail"
MSG:
- "Other Retail" Claim must contain the following:
Customer name
Customer account number
- Amount of capacity claimed on behalf of customer
- amount not to exceed last 12 months' peak
- customers w/o demand meter, use kWh equation ( $\mathbf{k W}=.004194 \times \mathbf{k W h}$ )
For each customer in claim, whether "Load Following" or "Capacity
Factor'
Duration of claim
This section may also be used for Residential Claims

| MSG Protocol: Modifications to Sept. 25 distribution |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | Customer contact information required for password |
| - | Sect. 5.e. Residential claim modifications |

"For Residential customer claims, the
supplier may submit peak monthly kWh in
lieu of the calculated peak demand."
"For customers without demand meters,
the supplier shall submit calculated peak
demand vaiues using the formula:
"
$\mathrm{kW}=.004194 \times \mathrm{kWh}$
add:
Section 5.d.(iii): remove:

MSG: "Residential" Claims: 2-part process (section 5.e)
Reservation Claim must contain:

- by e-mail to SupplierSupport@firstenergycorp.com
• List of customer names
- via Web site
• Total number of customers in claim
• Aggregate amount of capacity claimed
• Duration of claim
Follow-up Claim within 40 days must contain:
: Customer account number
• Customer name
• Amount of capacity claimed on behalf of each customer
amount not to exceed last 12 months' peak
use kWh equation ( kW = . 004194 x kW) for all customers
• Whether claim for each customer is Load Following or Capacity Factor
MSG: Maximum Amount of Capacity per customer
- Residential and all customers without demand meter
- use calculated peak based on peak energy usage
- equation: $\quad \mathrm{kW}=.004194 \times \mathrm{kWh}$ Other Retail customers with demand meter
- use highest measured demand in last 12 months
Customers without 12 months billing history (footnote 5)
- residential / small commercial: use rate schedule averages
- other customers: base on facts as known
- method subject to company approval Other Retail customers with demand meter
- use highest measured demand in last 12 months
Customers without 12 months billing history (footnote 5)
- residential / small commercial: use rate schedule averages
- other customers: base on facts as known
- method subject to company approval Other Retail customers with demand meter
- use highest measured demand in last 12 months
Customers without 12 months billing history (footnote 5)
- residential / small commercial: use rate schedule averages
- other customers: base on facts as known
- method subject to company approval Other Retail customers with demand meter
- use highest measured demand in last 12 months
Customers without 12 months billing history (footnote 5)
- residential / small commercial: use rate schedule averages
- other customers: base on facts as known
- method subject to company approval
운


Load Following and Capacity Factor Options
- Load Following (Supplemental Sip.)
- no scheduling or load factor requirements
- no imbalance charges up to historic peak load
- Load Following

| - serve customer's entire load |
| :--- |
| - no scheduling or load factor requirements |
| - no imbalance charges up to historic peak load |

- $\quad$ Capacity Factor
$-\quad$ service to entire load
$\quad$ - monthly minimum
- service to part of a cu - usage limitations--on/off peak and seasonal
- settlement requirements
in either case:
service to entire load
- monthly minimum cap
- scheduling require
- usage limitations--
1
- usage limitations--on/off peak and seasonal
- scheduling requirements
- usage limitations--on/off peak
load


$$
-0.0
$$

(Supplemental Sip.)
$\because$

C
(Res, Sm
 -
K!

in either case: either case:

- purchaser may resell to extent end user does not take
- payment for contracted capacity or energy, taken or not
MSG: Approval Process

- Confirmed contract between customer and supplier for duration claimed FE must be able to verify duration (audit methods) '


## Supplier certification and registration

 Verify names/account nos.Claimed capacity matches peak levels

- 30 days to get certification from PUCO / potential waiver to extend time
- Verify names/account nos.
- FE to reduce excess amount to historic peak
- failure for more than $1 \%$ of load/customers =-> claim rejected

[^9]| MSG: Claim Duration |
| :--- |
| Claims to be in 12-month increments or till end of Mkt. Devel. Period |

these are both claims for
August 2001 to July 2002

$\boldsymbol{O}$

| MSG: Other Items in Protocol |
| :--- |
| - Claimant may withdraw claim prior to approval |
| - Discontinuation of service to customer results, at |
| company's option, in MSG being returned to pool or |
| minimum capacity factor obligation |
| - Only one supplier's claim for part or all of customer's load |
| $\quad$ will be accepted for a given duration |
| - No more than one claim for MSG and one for non-MSG |
| per customer for a given duration |
| - FE affiliates--relinquish claims as of next effective meter |
| read date |

Market Support Generation: Comments and Issues

- Government Aggregators
- First-come-first-served basis
- Committed capacity sales to OE / CEI / TE customers
- Alternate process to which all claimants agree?
- Scheduling: process to follow at later date .

0

# Market Support Gener̄ation Validation Criteria 

## Claim Table Definitions:

1) the operating company [either $O E, C E I$, or TE]
2) the customer category code [either (R)esidential or (O)ther]
3) the claim type [either (M)SG or (N)on-MSG]

## Claim Table Validation Criteria:

1) Once assigned, the claim number may not be changed.
2) Every claim must be for the same operating company, customer category, claim type code (either MSG or non-MSG), time period, and supplier.
3) Each claim can be in any one of the following states:
a) New - reserved for claims that have yet to be submitted to FirstEnergy for approval.
b) Reserved - indicates that the supply intends to retain a placeholder in the queue, but does not have the finalized supporting customer contract data to supply at the present time. The Reserved claim must be replaced within a 40 -day period. If no replacement list has been supplied, the claim will automatically be erred out.
c) Pending - designates that the supplier has finalized the claim and has submitted it to FirstEnergy for approval.
d) Verified - indicates that the claim was verified by FirstEnergy and is Reserved for manual approval. The verification is performed automatically by the validation routine. Additional manual checks may be perforned, if need be, by the FE approvers.
e) Approved - shows that the claim was approved by FirstEnergy. The power is reserved for this supply for these customers for the specified time frame.
f) Canceled - No longer an active ctaim. Claims may be cancelled by the supplier, the FE administrator, or automatically by the MSG system.
4) Whenever the company, customer category code, claim type, or status code changes for a claim, then the MW balances will automatically be recalculated by the system.
5) The start date must be the first of the selected month. If it is not, the system will make it so.
6) The end date must be the last day of the selected month. If it is not, the system will make it so.
7) The start date must be less than the end date and must be at least twelve months in duration.
8) The start date must be greater than or equal to the beginning of the market development period.
9) The end date must be less than or equal to the beginning of the market development period.
10) Capture the peak billing load (in kW ) of these customers. This will later be valldated against the sum of the contracts for this claim. If the sum is greater than the reservation amount, then the claim is in error and the supplier will need to modify the claim such that the sum of the contracts no longer exceeds the reserved amount.
11) For Approved claims, ensure that:
a) The operating company cannot be modified
b) The customer category code cannot be modified
c) The claim type cannot be modified
d) the supplier must not be an Inactive supplier. If valid, set the approval date and clear out the cancel-related columns.
12) For Reserved claims, ensure that:
a) The claim must be Residential
i) If so, the estimated number of customers and the estimated requested kW must be entered. If valid, set the submission date.
ii) If not, produce an error message.
13) For Pending claims,:
a) The operating company, customer category code, and claim type cannot be modified
14) For Verified claims,
a) The operating company, customer category code, and claim type cannot be modified

# Market Support Gener亠 $\overline{\text { antion }}$ Validation Criteria 

## Customer Contract Table Definitions:

1) account number - no format - must be $\mathbf{1 5}$ characters in length
a) $O E$ - prefixed by a ' 2 '
b) CEI - prefixed by a '01' (after October 2000 - prefixed by '6)
c) TE - prefixed by a '02' (after October 2000 - prefixed by '3)
2) Claim type - either load following (L) or capacity factor (C) - only applicable to non-MSG.

## Customer Contract Table Validation Criteria:

1) All contracts must be in $\mathbf{1 2}$ month increments unless they go to the end of the market development period.
2) All contracts under a single claim must be for the same period of time.
3) Customer contracts can span across calendar years.
4) Currently the market development period is established as January 1,2001 to Decemeber 31, 2005.
5) The start date must be the first of the selected month.
6) The end date must be the last day of the selecfed month.
7) The start date must be less than the end date and must be at least one month in duration.
8) The start date must be greater than or equal to the beginning of the market development period.
9) The end date must be less than or equal to the beginning of the market development period.
10) Both the start and end dates are set by a trigger to ?nsure that they match the valid contract periods.
11) Upon entry, the application performs some quick validation checks, namely,
a) The account number prefix must be appropriate for the operating company (i.e. for $O E$, first digit of the account number must start with a '2').
b) The account number length must be appropriate for the operating company (i.e. for OE, the total length must be exactly 15 digits).
12) If the account number has been changed from the old CEI/TE format to the new format, then create an audit trail record of this transformation.

## Customer Contract Table Processing:

The application will automatically overlay the amount claimed value in three different situations:

1) if the system detects an "overclaimed" condition (i.e. when the amount claimed is greater than the 12 months' peak)
2) if the claim is for Load Following and the amount claimed is less than the 12 months' peak
3) if the customer has no billing history and the amount claimed is greater than the class averages (based upon the customer's rate code).

## Customer Contract Table Validation Against CIS Table:

After submitting the claim to FE, the application will perform the following validation checks against the CIS Master table for each customer contract:
-1) Ensure that the Claim exists on the MSG database.
2) Ensure that the Claim is in the Submitted (Pending) status.
3) Ensure that the Account Number exists on the CIS table.
4) Validate that the Rate is associated to the Customer Category (Residential or Other) selected on the Claim.
5) Verify that the Supplier is an active Certified CRES registered with FE. If not, produce a waming message.
6) For Reserved Claims, ensure that the reserved amount is not exceeded by the sum of the claimed amounts for all customers.
7 Processing: Convert all kWH amounts to kW for Comparison purposes.
8) If overclaimed condition, reduce the claimed amount to the CIS peak amount.
9) If Load Following and underclaimed condition, rese the claimed amount to the CIS peak amount.

## Market Support Generation Validation Criteria

## Customer Contract Table Approval:

1) Ensure that no residual Validation errors exist for claim.
2) The supplier must be an Active supplier registered with FE. If not, claim is in error.

Modifications to the PROTOCOL FOR FIRST-COME-FIRST-SERVED CLAIMS FOR MARKET SUPPORT AND NON-MARKET SUPPORT GENERATION since the September 25, 2000 distribution

## Modiflcation 1: Section 5.d.(iii)

Remove second sentence of section.
Substitute the following:
"For customers without demand meters, the supplier shall submit calculated peak demand values using the formula: $\mathrm{kW}=.004194 \times \mathrm{kWh}{ }^{\mathrm{n}}$

Modification 2: $\quad$ Sections 5.a., 5.d.(vi.), and 5.e.
Add at the end of the section 5.a.: "...and has supplied to FirstEnergy the supplier name, address, telephone and fax numbers, contact person name and e-mail address, or predetermined supplier identifier code provided by the company. "

Remove section 5.d.(vi.)
In section 5.e., remove the reference to (vi.) and reposition the word "and" before (v.).

## Modification 3: Section 5.e.

Add language referring to the Residential claims as a two-part process, including the Reservation Claim and the Follow-up Claim.

Remove the reference to (iv.) in the second line of the first sentence, and add the requirement to provide the section (iv.) information to the Follow-up Claim.

Modification 4: Section 6.b.(viii)
The reference to 6.b.(viii) is changed to 6.a.(viii).
Modification 5: Footnote 11
The reference to 15 days is changed to 12 days.

September 28, 2000

## PROTOCOL FOR FIRST-COME-FIRST-SERVED CLAIMS FOR <br> MARKET SUPPORT AND NON-MARKET SUPPORT GENERATION

PART A - CLAIM

## Section 1 Purpose of Document

1.a. The Stipulation documents in Case 99-12§2-EL-ETP et al. (FirstEnergy restructuring case) establish Generation Commitments on behalf of the company.
1.b. Section V. 1 of the April 13, 2000 Stipulation and Recommendation calls for Ohio Edison, Cleveland Electric and Toledo Edison to provide 1,120 MW of systern level generation capacity to non-affiliated and eligible affiliated marketers and brokers and aggregators (i.e., "suppliers") for the duration of the market development period.
1.c. The Supplemental Settlement Materials agreement further describes the availability and applicability of such market support generation (section 2) and specifies that, during the months of September through May, 1,120 MW of the supply of generation other than market support generation will be "measured at the distribution meter" (section 5). This will be defined as non-market support generation. Under this section 5 , FirstEnergy supplies the line losses, within its control area, for the 1,120 MW increment of non-market support generation (non-MSG).

## Section 2 Definitions

2.a. FE or the Company - shall refer to FirstEnergy and its operating companies
2.b. MSG - shall mean Market Support Generation as described in Section 1.b. of this document
-2.c. Non-MSG - means non-Market Support Generation as described in Section 1.c. of this document ${ }^{1}$
2.d. CRES - refers to Certified Retail Electricity Supplier
2.e. Eligible Supplier - means a supplier that has met the eligibility requirements defined in Section 4 of this document

[^10]2.f. Generation Service Agreement - the commitment of a customer to purchase generation from or through an Eligible Supplier
2.g. EDI - means Electronic Data Interchange which format a Supplier will utilize to submit án electronic enrollment of a customer for retail electric service
2.h. Commission or PUCO - means the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

## Section 3 Allocation of Generation Commitments between companies and retall customer classes

Each of the two Generation Commitments is allocated among the companies and retail customer classes, as follows:
3.a. MSG (Market Support Generation)

| Category 1 | Ohio Edison | Residential ${ }^{2}$ | 260 MW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category 2 |  | Other Retail | 300 MW |
| Category 3 | The llluminating Company | Residential | 170 MW |
| Category 4 |  | Other Retail | 230 MW |
| Category 5 | Toledo Edison | Residential | 70MW |
| Category 6 |  | Other Retail | 90 MW |

Total MSG commitment 1,120 MW
3.b. Non-MSG (Service area line losses)

| Category 7 | Ohio Edison | Residential at least |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Category 8 | 156 MW |  |

Category 9 The Illuminating Company Residential at least | 102 MW |
| :--- |
| Cotegory 10 |$\quad 400 \mathrm{MW}$

[^11]| Category 11 | Toledo Edison | Residential at least | 42 MW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category 12 |  | Total (incl. Res.) | 160 MW |
|  | Total Non-MSG |  | 120 MW |

## Section 4 Eligibility to submit a claim

Only claims by Eligible Suppliers will be considered for approval.

## 4.a Non-affiliated <br> Any marketer, broker or aggregator, non-affiliated with any Ohio investorowned utility, that has submitted-an application to the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio to be certified as a CRES and an application to FirstEnergy for registration is eligible to submit a claim.

## 4.b Affiliated

In addition to the above requirements, a utility affiliate will qualify to submit a claim if the affiliate or utility (1) makes capacity available within the utilities' service areas offering choice in a similar manner and magnitude as the claimed generation or (2) has no owned or leased generating capacity within one wheeling transaction from FE's service areas.

## 4.c. Government Aggregators

Any supplier that participates as a Government Aggregator will quality to submit a claim by showing evidence of an enacted ordinance and verification that the residents' opt out procedure has been performed so that the amount of load the Aggregator can supply may be determined.

## 4.d. Customer Aggregators

A customer seeking to acquire MSG capacity or reserve loss absorption on non-MSG capacity on behalf of its own facilities must become an Eligible Supplier in order to be considered for approval.

## Section 5 First-come-first-served process: initial queues

The Stipulation Documents call for the capacity commitments identified in Section 3 as Categories 1 through 12 to be made available to Eligible Suppliers on a first-come-first-served basis. This section outlines the criteria for establishing the queue.
5.a. A claim for available capacity must be submitted electronically by an Eligible Supplier via the process identified in this protocol. The forms and protocol are available on FirstEnergy's public web site (identify web site
address). Submission of a claim will require a password, which will be made available to the Eligible Supplier that has submitted an application to the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio to be centified as a CRES and an application to FirstEnergy for registration, and has supplied to FirstEnergy the supplier name, address, telephone and fax numbers, contact person name and e-mail address, or predetermined supplier identifier code provided by the company.
5.b. A claim is to be made for one of the Categories 1 through 12, identified in Section 3 of this document.
5.c. A claim can include the load for as many customers as the Eligible Supplier serves ${ }^{3}$. However, each claim must contain only a single duration for all the customers in the claim. If there are multiple durations for the customers for which the supplier is claiming generaion, a separate claim must be made for each duration.

The Generation Commitments are available only in increments of twelve consecutive months, or until the end of the market development period, whichever terminates earlier. A monthly period is defined to be the period covered by the company's regularly scheduled cycle bill. The last day of the cycle billing period shall determine in which month the claim falls. The initial period starts with the customer's first bill cycle after January 1, 2001. Requests for capacity for nonconsecutive twelve monthly periods must be made as separate claims.
5.d. Each claim for "Other Retail" MSG or non-MSG must contain the following information (each claim is for one Category only) ${ }^{4}$ :
(i) name of each retail customer for whom the supplier has a Generation Service Agreement
(ii) the account number for each retail customer identified in (i.)
(iii) the amount of capacity being claimed on behalf of each retail customer (this amount cannot exceed the amount of the customer's

[^12]peak load) ${ }^{5}$. For customers without demand meters, the supplier shall submit calculated peak demand values using the formula:
$$
\mathrm{kW}=.004194 \times \mathrm{kWh} .
$$
(iv) for Market Support Generation, whether the capacity claimed for each retail customer will be classified as "Load Following" or "Capacity Factor" ${ }^{6}$
(v) the time period (duration) for which the claim is made, for which period the supplier must have a Generation Service Agreement for all customers included in the claim
5.e. Claims for "Residential" MSG or non-MSG shall be submitted in a two-part process containing a "Reservation Claim" and a "Follow-up Claim" unless the supplier uses the provisions of section 5.d. to make the claim. The Reservation Claim must contain the same information as identified in section $5 . d$ (i) and ( $v$ ) above. In addition, the claimant must specify in ine Reservation Claim the aggregate amount of MSG capacity or non-MSG line losses, and the total number of customers for which the claim is being made. The claimant must subsequently provide, within 40 days of this Reservation Claim, a Follow-up Claim providing the information specified in section 5 .d (ii), (iii) and (iv) for each customer included in the claim. The company's approval process will not begin prior to the time when the information in section 5 .d (ii), (iii) and (iv) is provided. Failure to supply the data in Section $5 . \mathrm{d}$ (ii), (iii) and (iv) within 40 . days will result in removing the claim from the queue.

[^13]5.f. The first-come-first-served rule will be followed based on the time of submittal of the claim on the company's web site.
5.g. Pending claims in the queue

Once an Eligible Supplier's claim is submitted on the web site, the total amount of claimed capacity in the submission will be categorized as "pending", meaning that
(i) the supplier has reserved a place in the first-come-firstserved queue, subject to the approval process, and
(ii) the utility will start the application review to determine that the requirements for approval are met.
(iii) The pending claim for the customer's load will be noted on the company's public web site as a "pending market support or non-market support generation claim". The identity of the customers and Eligible Suppliers will not be posted on the public web site.

## Section 6 Approval Process

6.a. The Company will begin the approval process following the receipt of the totality of the information specified in Section 5.d. or 5.e., whichever Section applies to the submitted claim. It is the Company's objective to complete the approval process as soon as possible after receipt of the required information in Section 5.d. or 5.e. The Company's approval process includes:
(i) verification that the supplier (including customers aggregating their own facilities' loads) has been approved as a Certified Retail Electricity Supplier (CRES), by the Public Utilities Commission and has been registered with the utility. ${ }^{7}$

[^14](ii) determination that the retail customer accounts and customers' names match, and that the identified customers are in fact customers of the utility.
(iii) for Market Support Generation, determination that (i) for Load Following Option accounts the claimed market support generation equals each customer's historic peak level, and that (ii) for Capacity Factor Option accounts, the claimed market support generation is equal to or less than the historic peak level for each customer. If the claim exceeds the customer's historic peak load level, the company shall reduce the claim to that historic peak load level and notify the supplier.
(iv) determination that the supplier has a contract (or an alternative form of verification ${ }^{8}$ with the retail customer that has a duration at least as long as the duration of the claim for MSG capacity non-MSG line losses. ${ }^{9}$
(v) agreement by the supplier to a contract to abide by the terms of the applicable Open Access Transmission Tariff and the applicable service agreement. ${ }^{10}$
(vi) determination that there is remaining capacity to meet the claim for the Company and retail customer class as identified in the application. ${ }^{11}$
(vii) determination that the supplier, if a utility or affiliate, qualifies per the eligibility requirement stated previously in Section 4.2 of this document.
6.b. Should the Company determine that an Eligible Supplier's application not meet the requirements listed in Section 6.a. above, the following provisions apply:

[^15](i) If the Supplier fails to be certified as a Certified Retail Electricity Supplier (CRES) within the stated time limits, the claim shall be denied; should the Supplier subsequently become an approved CRES, a new claim for market support or non-market support generation must be made
(ii) If the insufficiency is the result of the Supplier's failure to register with the company, which includes EDI testing, the supplier shall have 30 days to become registered upon notification by the Company or the Supplier shall forfeit its place in the queue.
(iii) If the insufficiency is a result of the retail customer accounts and customers' names not matching or a determination that the listed customers are not customers of the utiity, the Supplier shall have five business days ${ }^{12}$, after receipt of notification by the utility of such fact, to remedy such mismatch by submitting a replacement retail customer list in the specified electronic form. Such replacement list shall include corrections only to the original application.
(iv) If the replacement list required by Section 6.b.iii is not received in the time period, or if it is deficient, the Supplier shall forfeit its place in the first-come-first-served queue for those customers for whom information is deficient.
(v) If the replacement list required by Section 6.a.(iii) results in a lesser or equal amount of market support capacity being claimed than was identified in the initial claim, such replacement value shall be deemed to be the Supplier's claim for capacity.
(vi) If the replacement list required by Section 6.b.iii results in a greater amount of market support capacity being claimed, the excess of the new amount of capacity over the initial claim shall be treated as a new claim at the end of the thenexisting queue.
(vii) If FE determines that at the time of application, the Eligible Supplier does not have a contract with any retail customer with the required contract duration, the supplier will forfeit its place in the queue for that part of the claim associated with customer who is not under contract. If it is determined for a claim for Residential MSG or non-MSG that the Eligible

[^16]Supplier does not have a contract for the duration of the claim for $1 \%$ or more customers, the claim shall be rejected in its entirety. If it is determined for a claim for Other Retail MSG or non-MSG that the supplier does not have a contract for the duration of the claim for $1 \%$ of the claimed load, the claim shall be rejected in its entirety.
(viii) If the Eligible Supplier fails to agree to the requirements of Section 6.b.(v), the application for capacity will be denied in its entirety.
(ix) If the utility or affiliate described in Section 4.b. above, does not make capacity available within its service area in a similar manner and magnitude as the claim or has owned or leased generating capacity within one wheeling transaction from FE's service areas, which would make the utility or affiliate ineligible for the MSG generation, the Eligible Supplier shall forfeit its place in the queue.
(x) If the claim for MSG or non-MSG exceeds the remaining generation in the specified category, the Eligible Supplier will be notified as such and given the option to modify its claim to equal the remaining generation. Such notification may be required for a part of the claim duration submitted by the Eligible Supplier; eg. month 11 of a 24 month claim may exceed the available generation in the specified category.
6.c. An Eligible Supplier may withdraw its claim for market support or nonmarket support generation on behalf of an individual retail customer in its entirety at any time prior to approval of the application.
6.d. If an Eligible Supplier were to discontinue serving a retail customer for which it had an approved market support or non-market support generation capacity claim and had proceeded with its use, at the Company's option, either the supplier's right to that capacity is forfeited and the claimed generation would be returned to the pool for that category, or the supplier shall be subject to a minimum monthly capacity factor identified in the Stipulation for the term of the approved claim.
6.e. Once the utility has approved an application for the claimed generation, the amount and duration of the claim shall be noted on the utility's public web site as an approved claim for market support or non-market support generation. The identity of the customers and suppliers will not be posted on the public web site.

## Section 7 Electronic Data Interchange

In the event that the enrollment process for a particular customer with the company is not completed by the time the supplier schedules the claimed generation, the supplier shall forfeit the approved claim for that customer and the claimed generation would be returned to the pool for that category.

## Section 8 FirstEnergy contact

For questions relating to market support generation, the FirstEnergy contact is:
Douglas S. Bumell
Administrator, Competitive Energy Supplier Contracts
FirstEnergy Corp.
76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308
phone: 330-384-4813 fax: 330-255-1047
e-mail: SupplierSupportefirstenergycorp.com

October 5, 2000

To: Bumelld@firstenergycorp.com
cc: headingsd@ firstenergycorp.com, dmblank@ firstenergycorp.com, korkosza@firstenergycorp.com, Denise R. Dinie
Date: 01/12/2001 08:03 AM
From: vaccarom@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Now MSG URL...

## Doug,

Based upon our current ISD rules goveming corporate URL names, we are planning to rename the current MSG Supplier site from http://www.firstenergycorp.com/msg to http:/supplierservices.firstenergycorp.com/msg next Tuesday, January 16, 2001 moming at around 7:00 a.m.

We are suggesting that you update every link in the FE Supplier Support site to represent this new URL address. Additionally, we recommend that you use every means (List Server, direct e-mails, ...) possible to inform all users (Suppliers, Communications and Legal depts, Regulators, intemal FE employees using the MSG application...) that this site has been altered. Additionally, they should be informed that they should update any and all bookmarks to this site.

If the current URL is requested after Tuesday, our plan is to display (for approximately 5 seconds) a page informing them that the MSG URL has been changed
from http://www.firstenergycorp.corr/msg to http://supplierservices.firstenergycorp.com/msg and that their bookmarks and favorites should be modified accordingly.

Nóte: The other MSG URLs [for Security and Approval processing] will not modified as these are accessed through our Watt intranet. The link on our'internal Watt home page pointing to the MSG Supplier Tool will be modified by Tom Cellucci and will not require your attentlon.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me immediately at $\times 3748$ or via $\theta$-mail.

Thanks, Marc

## Arthur Andersen <br> ABA

To: Rilck G. Noel@ANDERSEN WO
cc:
Date: 11/07/2000 03:21 PM
From: Denise R. Dinie, Cleveland, 781/2759
Subject: MSG Supplier Claims Review

Rilck -
As per my voicemail response to you this aftemoon. Please provide comments either by Lotus Notes, Octel or via phone. If I do not hear from you by Wed. late afternoon, I will page you to discuss. We still do not have an idea of how many contracts this may entail. FE is working on the scopes (that is why they are in bold typing in the attached).

Thanks!
Denise

[^17]
## AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES WORK PROGRAM

| DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE COMPLETED | WORK COMPLEIED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | W/P REF. | BY |

The work you have engaged us to perform in accordance with our job arrangement letter with you, dated November XX, 2000, is outlined below. We understand that FirstEnergy has reviewed the MSG Supplier Claims (as defined below) for duplicate, ineligible, invalid and/or inactive Customer Accounts (or Contracts, as defined below) within and amongst each Supplier Claim. FirstEnergy's definitions of duplicate, ineligible, invalid and inactive Customer Contracts are attached hereto for reference purposes. In performing its review, FirstEnergy segregated each Supplier Claim into two lists - the believed irregular Customer Contracts and the believed valid Customer Contracts. The believed irregularities consist of the duplicate, ineligible, invalid and/or inactive Customer Contracts identified by FirstEnergy. These lists will be presented directly to the suppliers for resolution. Arthur Andersen will review the believed valid Customer Contracts based on the following work program.

Supplier Claim - A supplier's request for available generation capacity submitted in accordance with the protocol outlined by FirstEnergy for the suppliers. A claim may contain up to 10,000 customer accounts/contracts (as defined below), all of which must be "claiming" capacity for the same duration.

Customer Account (or Contract) - An individual customer account (or contract) that is included in a Supplier Claim.

1. For each Supplier Claim, obtain from FirstEnergy the listings of the believed irregular Customer Contracts and the believed valid Customer Contracts.
2. For each Customer Contract on the listings of the believed valid Customer Contracts, obtain from the supplier access to the related written, signed contract between the supplier and the customer. For the contracts tested in steps 3 . and 4. below, ensure the contracts are signed by both parties.
3. In connection with step 4. below, review the terms of the Customer Contracts and identify all provisions within the Customer Contracts that may bear upon the determination that the supplier has a contract (or alternative form of verification consistent with the verification required by the PUCO for CRES certification) with the retail customer. In performing this review, be alert for provisions within the Customer Contracts that may indicate that the Customer Contracts are not legal, binding commitments. For instance, if executory provisions, or a "letter of intent" or "option" to negotiate or enter into a contract, are provided for in the Customer Contracts. Document the location(s) of such provision(s) within the Customer Contracts and document the concern(s) with such provision(s).

## AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES WORK PROGRAM

## CLIENT: FirstEnergy Corp.

WORK: MSG Supplier Claims Review DATE: November XX, 2000


Based on our discussions with you, it is our understanding that in performing the above, Customer Contracts that are conditioned solely upon the approval for receipt of MSG or non-MSG capacity shall be considered legal binding contracts unless the Customer Contracts contain other provisions that may call into question the legal commitment.
4. In descending order based on capacity claimed, review the listing (by claim) of believed valid Customer Contracts and compare for consistency the following information on the listing to the related written contracts between the supplier and the customers.
A. Customer account number (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)
B. Customer name (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)
C. Service address (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)
D. Quantity of generation claimed (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)
E. Type of customer/generation claimed (residential vs. non-residential and MSG vs. non-MSG) (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)
F. Duration (period) (insert column name and number of the column from the listings prepared by FirstEnergy)

Continue to compare for consistency the information regarding the Customer Contracts on the listing of believed valid Customer Contracts to the related written contracts between the supplier and the customer, in descending order, until either:

- Customer Contracts within the following scopes have been reviewed
- All Customer Contracts with capacity claims equal to or greater than $1,000 \mathrm{~kW}$,
- 33\% of Customer Contracts (systematically selected) with capacity claims equal to or greater than 200 but less than $1,000 \mathrm{~kW}$, and
- 10\% of Customer Contracts (systematically selected) with capacity claims less than 200 kW ; OR


## AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES WORK PROGRAM

## CLIENT: _ FirstEnergy Corp.

WORK: MSG Supplier Claims Review $\quad$ DATE: $\quad$ November XX, 2000

|  |  |  | WORK COMPLEIED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE COMPLETED |  | W/P |  |

$\because$

- For claims in the "other retail" category (i.e., non-residential), upon consideration of the review results for the Customer Contracts reviewed in steps 3. and 4., it can be determined that the supplier does not have written contracts for at least $5 \%$ of the total quantity of generation capacity claimed in the Supplier Claim containing those Customer Contracts.

5. Prepare a summary by claim of the results of our work.
6. Draft a representation letter regarding the procedures that have been agreed upon and obtain a signed copy from FirstEnergy.

Claims for Denise to audit


## Claims Pending

176 TOL
189 TOL 187 TOL 2191 TOL All of these are pending waiting the choice of a supplier.

- We should wait to approve the last bit of the last claim in the queue until Brewer's revised loss factors are reflected in the claims data base.
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To: murraykm@MWNCMH.COM
cc: Burnelld@firstenergycorp.com, dmblank@firstenergycorp.com, Denise R. Dinie @ANDERSEN WO, headingsd ©firstenergycorp.com
Date: 01/12/2001 10:39 AM
From: vaccarom@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Approval of Claim \#55 and Creation of Claim \#2652...

Kevin,

Per our phone conversation and your instructions, I have successfully performed the following tasks:
canceled contract (Contractno $=1872, ~ L E D \& \in T E D$

removed contract (Contractno $=1879$, . REDACME゙D

approved claim \#55 for a total of $170,673.455 \mathrm{kw}$.
created claim \#2652 with one contract ( $R$ ED A C RET;

This remains in the exact same queue location as original claim $\# 55$ as it was created with the same Submission Date.
validated claim \#2652 for $6,118.00 \mathrm{kw}$.
created a comment on claim \#2652 to indicate that this was created from claim \#55 as a result of a "partial power adjustment" situation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (330) 384-3748.

Thank You For Your Cooperation,
Marc
©2001 Andersen. Al rights reserved.
Denise R. Dinie

To: dmblank@firstenergycorp.com
cc: headingsd@firstenergycorp.com, Burnelld@firstenergycorp.com, Denise R. Dinie@ANDERSEN WO, korkosza@firstenergycorp.com
Date: 01/19/2001 09:27 AM
From: vaccarom@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Dropped IEU Customers from Approved Claims...

Ladies \& Gentlemen,

Per Kevin Murray's instructions, I have successfully removed the suggested customers from the previously approved IEU claims (reter to attached spreadsheets for details) as of 9:10 a.m. today. As a result of these reductions, the revised Remaining kW is currently being displayed on the web-site. Please note that we now have 4.29 mw remaining in Ohio Edison's claim pool.

This has had the following effect on the claim pools:
For OE/Other/MSG, these actions freed up $3,858.9 \mathrm{~kW}$ (+ 523.33 in
losses) as a result of claim \#55 dropping eight RETA ACtTsaccounts reducing their allocation from $170,673.46$ to $166,814.56 \mathrm{kw}$.
For CEI/Other/MSG, dropping the RとDHCTEl) : account on claim \#68 made $6,834.996$ ( +690.34 in losses) available to this claim pool. For TE/Other/MSG, canceling the three RE゙DACTED accounts for claim \#61 has added $15,200.5(+1,187.36$ in losses) to Toledo's remaining pool.

I will provide a new FIFO Submission report today so that you can see the result of these cancellations.

Thanks, Marc
-------------------- Forwarded by Marc J. Vaccaro/OE/FirstEnergy on
01/19/2001 08:55 AM $\qquad$

Kevin Murray [murraykm@MWNCMH.COM](mailto:murraykm@MWNCMH.COM) on 01/18/2001 03:34:52 PM
To: "Mark Vaccaro (E-mail)" [vaccarom@ifirstenergycorp.com](mailto:vaccarom@ifirstenergycorp.com)
cc: "Doug Burnell (E-mail)" [burnelld@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:burnelld@firstenergycorp.com), "Blank, David M. (E-mail)" <dmblank © firstenergycorp.com>

Subject: Dropped iLDACitiaccounts.xis
<<Dropped RLisAcrinaccounts.xis>>


Mark－per our telephone discussion，the attached spreadsheet identifies the
REDACRTD accounts we would like to drop from MSG claim \＃55．These facilities have been sold and we are not authorized to aggregate these facilities as part of IEU－OH＇s group．

Also，I have cancelled the one account on claim \＃2652．I was able to do this vla the website．There are no accounts remaining on this claim．

I realized after we spoke that I have a couple of accounts on TE and CEI that are on an approved claim that I need to drop．I will send a second email with details．

Please give me a call if you have any questions．Thanks
Kevin Murray
McNees，Wallace \＆Nurick
614．719．2844
murraykm＠mwnemh．com
（See attached file：Dropped QEDitiziD accounts．xis）
－－－．－．．．．－－．．．．．．．．．．．．．－Forwarded by Marc J．Vaccaro／OE／FirstEnergy on
01／19／2001 08：55 AM

Kevin Murray＜murraykm＠MWNCMH．COM＞on 01／18／2001 03：50：16 PM
To：＂Mark Vaccaro（E－mail）＂＜vaccarom＠firstenergycorp．com＞
cc：
Subject：RE゙DAこそてj）t yropped accounts．xls

REDACTED QLITA Jropped accounts．xls＞＞
Mark－the attached spreadsheets identifies other accounts that need to be dropped from TE and CEI claims．Claim number is on the spreadsheet． Reason code should be customer dropped supplier．Thanks．

## Kevin Murray

McNees，Wallace \＆Nurick
614．719．2844
murraykm＠mwnemh．com
（See attached tile： $\operatorname{lzDNC}$（CD dropped accounts．xis）



RtDA(CED Opped accounts.xls

C2001 Andersen. All rights reserved.
Denise R. Dinie


## Arthur Andersen

ABA

To: murraykm@mwnemh.com
cc: dryan@mwnemh.com
Date: 01/08/2001 01:58 PM
From: Denise R. Dinie, Cleveland, 781 / 2759
Subject: MSG second round review

Hi Kevin!

Hope all is well. I have completed most of my second round reviews of the MSG claims and have just a few follow up questions/actions for you.

Your voicemail and fax concerning the second round claims being reviewed were exactly what I needed. Thanks!

I have attached below an error report for the IEU clairns reviewed during this second round. My understanding is that the errors are now appearing on the FirstEnergy MSG website on a daily basis. As a result, you may have already corrected many (or all) of the errors. In order to facilitate the approval process, you may want to double check the attached error list to ensure all errors that require (required) attention have either been corrected or canceled.

Please let me know if you have further questions. Thanks!
Denise

02001 Andersen. All rights reserved.
Denise R. Dinie

## MSG CLAIM ERRORS

## INVALID ACCOUNT NUMBER

DEFINITION - FirstEnergy is unable to match the account number submitted by the supplier with an account number contained in the FirstEnergy CIS records.

## INACTIVE CUSTOMER STATUS

DEFINITION - the account number (per FirstEnergy CIS records) included in a supplier's claim is coded as "Inactive". Inactive means that FirstEnergy is no longer issuing a bill for this account number because the customer has discontinued service.

## INELIGIBLE CUSTOMER ACCOUNT FOR CLAIM

DEFINITION - a residential account that is included in a claim that a supplier has submitted in the Other Retail claim pool; or a non-residential account contained in a claim submitted in the Residential claim pool.

## DUPLICATE ACCOUNT DETECTED

DEFINITION - accounts having the same account number (per FirstEnergy Customer Information System records) that are included more than once in the same claim or in more than one claim for the same time period. Claims may be by the same supplier or from different suppliers. The MSG/Non-MSG categorization is ignored in making this determination.

## FIRSTENERGY CORP. MSG CLAIMS CUSTOMER CONTRACTS NOT SUBJECT TO THE INITIAL REVIEW PROCESS

Due to the MSG claims that contain the customers listed below being submitted after the commencement of the initial MSG claims review process. the following customer contracts were not subjected to the initial claims review process. As a result. I am providing you with this list so that you may prepare these customer contracts for teview.

In order to perform this review in the most efficient and effective manner, to the extent possible, I have been asked to complete the work by way of phone, fax, e-mail and ovemight mail. In order to do this. I am requesting that you prepare partially redacted copies of your contracts with the foliowing customers and send them to the fax number that delivers directly to my e-mail (216-774-6850) or by way of ovemight delivery to my office (Denise Dinie. Arthur Andersen LLP. Suite 1800. 200 Public Square, Cleveland. Ohio 44114).

In preparing your partially redacted contracts, it is important that you leave at least the provision numbers (paragraph numbers) and provision titles (paragraph headers) in the contracts UNREDACTED. This information is pertinent to my understanding of the types of provisions that are included in these contracts. If upon review of the partially redacted information I determine that additional follow-up is required with you in order to understand certain provisions of the contracts. I will contact you. In addition. please be sure to include the signed signature page(s) as well as any attachment(s) to the contracts that identify the specifics of the contracts, such as the locations covered and/or the pricing arrangements.

After completion of this process. upon written request. I will be happy to retum and/or destroy any and all contract copies that you have provided to me in order to complete this review. Should you have any questions, please give me a call at 216-348-2759. Thanks in advance for your assistance.

| Claim Number | Customer Name |
| :--- | :---: |
| $1756 / 2445 \quad$ | REDAC TE 1) |
| 2340 | ??? CEI Claim ??? |

Unfortunately, due to some data errors in claim 2340, FirstEnergy was unable to validate this data and provide me with the customer name(s) associated with this claim. If this claim is for a single customer, please provide me with the contract with that customer. If this claim is for multiple customers. please submit your ASCII files for the above claim to me and I will choose the customers for which I would like to see contracts.

## Arthur Andersen <br> ABA

To: murraykm@mwncmh.com, dryan@mwnemh.com
cc:
Date: $\quad 12 / 22 / 200004: 44$ PM
From: Denise R. Dinie, Cleveland, 781 / 2759
Subject: Re: FE MSG second round reviews

Hi! Happy Holidays!
I have attached a message that is going to all suppliers (as applicable) regarding the second round of contract reviews. The contracts I will need for this review are listed in the attached message. Should you have any questions, please give me a call.

Thanks in advance for your assistance!
Denise

G2000 Andersen. All rights reserived.
Denise R. Dinie


FIRSTENERGY CORP. REQUEST FOR MSG CLAIM "VALID," "ERROR" AND "DUPLICATE" REPORTS

Please run the above reports for the claims listed below so the review process may begin. When running the duplicate reports, please be sure to compare these claims to all other claims submitted. whether or not on this list.
Supplier Claim Number

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED

FIRSTENERGY CORP. REQUEST FOR MSG CLAIM "VALID," "ERROR" AND "DUPLICATE" REPORTS

Please run the above reports for the claims listed below so the review process may begin. When running the duplicate reports, please be sure to compare these claims to all other claims submitted, whether or not on this list.

as may
not get MSG allocation -
consider 4 op non. MSG

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { REDACTED } \\
& \text { REDACTED } \\
& \text { REDACTED } \\
& \text { REDACTED } \\
& \text { REDACTED } \\
& \text { REDACTED }
\end{aligned}
$$

FIRSTENERGY CORP.
REQUEST FOR MSG CLAIM "VALID," "ERROR" AND "DUPLICATE" REPORTS

Please run the above reports for the claims listed below so the review process may begin. When running the duplicate reports, please be sure to compare these claims to all other claims submitted, whether or not on this list.


REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
I REDACTED
REDACTED

```
To: Denise R. Dinie
cc: dryan@mwncmh.com, srandazzo@mwncmh.com
Date: 12/13/2000 12:46 PM
From: murraykm@mwncmh.com
Subject: Re: MSG Claims Review Follow Up
```


## Denise

Hopefully you received my autoreply that I am out of the office till Thursday afternoon. I will begin compiting the data requested once I return. I will forward your information request to Sam \& Debbie so that we may perhaps expedite responding to your request.

## Kevin Murray

...... Original Message .....
From: [denise.r.dinie@us.arthurandersen.com](mailto:denise.r.dinie@us.arthurandersen.com)
To: <murraykm © 1 mwncmh.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 12:12 PM
Subject: RE: MSG Claims Review Follow Up

```
>
>
> Hi Kevin!
>
> I believe we are in the final stages of the initial round of the MSG
claims
> reviews. In order to wrap up my review of your claims, I have put
together a
> summary of the information that I will need.
>
> (See attached file: IEU follow up.doc)
>
> Please provide the above information at your earliest convenience. As I
am sure
> you are aware, we are all trying to expedite this process as much as
possible
> and your assistance is appreciated.
>
> If you have any questions, please give me a call. Thanks!
>
> Denise Dinie
> Arthur Andersen LLP
> 216-348-2759 phone
```

$>$

```
>*..................Internet Email Confidentiality
Footer*!................*
>
>
> Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If
you
> are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for
delivery of.
> the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to
anyone.
> in such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notity the sender
by
> reply email. Please advise immediately if you or your employer do not
consent to
> Internet email for messages of this kind. Opinions, conclusions and other
> information in this message that do not relate to the official business of
my
> firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.
>
>
```

C2001 Andersen. All tights reserved.
Denise R. Dinie

# FIRSTENERGY CORP. <br> MSG ADP - FOLLOW UP NOVEMBER DECEMBER 2000 

INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS - OHIO

In order to finalize the review of the initial MSG claims submitted by Industrial Energy Users - Ohio (IEU), I have been asked to follow up on the items indicated below in order to obtain additional support.

1. Does IEU have any documentation of the dates that the following contracts were agreed to by these customers and the dates that the customers submitted their account data to IEU? Unfortunately, during my visit to IEU. I was unable to determine dates for these contracts as the date to be completed within the contracts regarding when the customer submitted account data to IEU was not filled in. In addition. I did not note any facsimile header printed on these contracts or any other verification as to when these customers agreed to these contracts. These customers are as follows:

- ReDaction
- hetbacter)

Please provide me with whatever evidence you have to support when these customers agreed to these contracts.
2. In reviewing the accounts for which you made claims. 7 of the accounts claimed are not in the name of the customer for those accounts according to First Energy's customer billing system. Please check your records and provide me with the correct customer names for these accounts. The account numbers are as follows:
$\cdot$
: Redacted -
-
: liedacteld
$\}$

To: Denise R. Dinie
cc: dmblank@tirstenergycorp.com, Burnelld@ firstenergycorp.com, headingsd @lirstenergycorp.com Date: 11/29/2000 06:06 PM
From: vaccarom@ (@irstenergycorp.com
Subject: MSG Follow-up

Denise.




I have re-validated all claims for IEU, \%LLED A CTED as of 6:00 p.m. tonight. There are several claims that still remain in error. Each supplier can view the error messages through the web-site. Doug has opted to manually handle (i.e. validate) $12 E$ i) $\hat{A} C \Gamma E D$ claims.

We have yet to re-import the accounts that we failed to import initialiy. We are going to suggest that, to make a clean break, Doug cancel all customer contracts in error after their due date has expired. Then, once Doug has completed this task, we can re-insert just those accounts and begin another 5 -day error correction period on those recently merged contracts. This would be the easiest solution from our standpoint. The supplier would receive an e-mail message for each claim that contains account number validation errors. Due to the inherent nature of the application, the supplier would not be able to modify any cancelled contract, just those that would be in error after the insertion of new accounts.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at $\times 3748$.
Thanks, Marc

02001 Andersen. All ights reserved.
Denise R. Dinie

To：$\quad$ Denise R．Dinie
cc：dryan＠mwncmh．com，vleach－payne＠mwncmh．com，srandazzo＠mwnemh．com
Date：11／22／2000 08：25 AM
From：murraykm © mwncmh．com
Subject：RE：follow up

Sorry for the delay in responding．We will send a copy via fax to your rightlax number and to your secretary＇s attention．Please return and／or destroy any paper and electronic copies once you have reviewed the contract．

The contract is by REDA（TED $\quad$ is a wholly owned subsidiary of RビロNCTE

Hope you have a nice holiday．Please let me know if you need aaditional information．

Kevin Murray
Technical Specialist
McNees，Wallace \＆Nurick
614.719 .2844
murraykm＠mwncmh．com
．．．．．Original Message－．．．．
From：denise．r．dinie＠us．arthurandersen．com
［mailto：denise．r．dinie＠us．arthurandersen．com］
Sent：Sunday，November 19， 2000 8：43 PM
To：murraykm＠mwnemh．com
Subject：follow up

## Hi Kevin！

I hope you had a nice weekend！As I wind into the final week of my fieldwork
related to the MSG claims review，I wanted to follow up with you to see if you
were able to locate the one contract that was missing the day I visited．If
you
were able to locate it，I will need to take a look at it．We can accomplish this in a couple of ways－（1）you may fax it to my rightfax number （216－774－6850），which sends the fax directly to my e－mailbox．I am the only individual with access to my e－mailbox；（2）you may fax it to my secretary， Nancy，at 216－771－3101；or（3）you may mail a copy to me at the below


## address

and I can either destroy it or mail it back to you upon completion of my review.
Please let me know the status.
Thanks and Best Regards!
Denise
Denise R. Dinie
Arthur Andersen LLP
Suite 1800
200 Public Square
Cleveland. Ohio 44114
phone 216-348-2759
Internet Email Confidentiality Footer*

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you
are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of
the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone.
In such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by
reply email. Please advise immediately if you or your employer do not consent to
Internet email for messages of this kind. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of my
firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.
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## Kevin Murray

From:
Sent: $\quad$ Wednesday, October 18, 2000 2:03 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: murraykm@mwncmh.com

Kevin,


First Energy IEU
Pool Load Dat...
Kevin,
I just got the informarion on the missing account atmoer. This is a new facility for SSA and we just got our Eirst bill. There are two accounts at this facility (usage at 2nd account very minor). See attachment with the update on \#5410.

Call with any questions.

## Kevin Murray

| From: | BOBWA8BCX@aol.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, October 17, 2000 10:07 AM |
| To: | Murraykm@mwncmh.com |
| Subject: | Addition to MSG Spreadsheet... |



05742 Ohio Electric Use...

Kevin:
I have attached an upcated spreadsheet with the one asicition kithuco Account added. Note the extreme upper, left hand cell: I'la aiways indicate the last revision there. $=: l s o$, the block added is higri:izited is (almost) scarlet red.
Bob
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# FIRSTENERGY CORP. MSG AUS <br> NOVEMBER 2000 

## INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS - OHIO

## MILEAGE - Cleveland to Columbus - 290 miles (star 1143; end 1433) <br> PARKING - Downtown Columbus - paid by IEU via ticket validation

On November 15: 2000. at 11:00 am. (until 5:30 pm.). I met with Sam Randazzo and Kevin Murray of IEU in order to perform the MSG claims review process. I presented Mr. Randazzo and Mr. Murray with the Error Reports and explained to them the contents of the package containing those reports. I also explained to them that the 5 day "correction" period. as outlined in the MSG Protocol provided by First Energy: began as the following day, November 16, 2000.

1 then discussed with the above individuals the review process for the "valid" claims. Upon completion of my explanation of the review process, IEU presented to me its contracts for my review. I began my review based upon the procedures agreed to by FirstEnergy, as outlined in Attachment A.

## There were several items that I noted recurred throughout most of the contracts that I reviewed. These items are as follows:

- As IEU is an aggregator. IEU entered into a draft Master Service Agreement with FirstEnergy Services (FES) on September 30. 2000. As of the date of my visit to IEU, this Master Service Agreement had not been finalized and executed. All contracts between IEU and the customers are subject to the Master Service Agreement that had not been executed (ie.. FES must accept the customers of IEU as parties to the Master Service Agreement and the customers of IEU must accept the terms of the Master Service Agreement). in pubstantially the parse form as the diff, The Master Service Agreement draft contains the pricing terms.

The duration of the Master Service Agreement draft (MSA) covers the market support period. The MSA is subject to early cancellation by FES but not before the end of the market support period. The MSA is subject to cancellation by any given customer (which would ultimately cancel the contract between IEU and the customer also) with twelve months written notice.

- The duration of the contracts between IEU and the customers is for a period of time "at least as long as the duration of IEU's MSG claim."

- The contracts between IEU and the customers are contingent upon the Master Service Agreement between IEU. FES and the customers being executed in substantially the same form as the draft.
- The contracts between IEU and the customers specify that IEU will request MSG on a "loadfollowing basis.
- For the most part. I was unable to determine that the customers had agreed to the locations to be covered by the contracts, as the customer information (account number, etc.) regarding the locations covered was contained in an attachment to the contracts. A provision within the contracts referred to the fact that the locations to be covered by the contract were identified in the attachment to the contract. The attachments were in the form of spreadsheets. The customers did not sign the attachments. I was not able to verify all customer account information as provided to me by FirstEnergy in the "valid" claims listing, as all of the customer account information was not contained in these attachments. However. in all instances. I was able to verify at least one piece of the customer account information (either the acceunt number, the customer name. or the service address).

Upon discussion of the above with Mr. Murray, I was informed that the attachments were primarily prepared by IEU from the information obtained from the customers. The customers sent information via facsimile and e-mail regarding their accounts. As this information was sent piecemeal, IEU summarized each customer's accounts into the spreadsheets that were used as the attachments to the contracts. Mr. Murray provided me copics of the e-mails and facsimiles from two of the customers and I ensured that there were no accounts included in the attachments for these customer contracts that were not included in the information provided to IEU by these customers.

- I did not specifically note provisions in any of the contracts to permit IEU to claim non-MSG on behalf of the customers in the event IEU does not receive a MSG allocation on behalf of the customers. The "valid" claims listing provided to me by FirstEnergy contains only MSG claims.

Upon review of the individual contracts, I noted the following inconsistencies between the "valid" claims listing provided to me by FirstEnergy and the contracts and/or I noted the following notable items.

- For the most part, I was unable to verify the date on which the customers signed the contracts, as the contracts were not manually dated. nor were there date fields to be completed by the customers* signatures. However, for the most part, I was able to identify dates via the customers' facsimile headers on the signed contracts or via the date that was inserted into the contract as the date that the customers had provided their account information to IEU. Of the 14 contracts that I reviewed, I was unable to determine anv date for 2 of the contracts. For the remainder of the contracts. the dates (based on the above mentioned sources) were on or before October 19. 2000.

CONFIDENTIAL

- The following customer names as per the claims do not appear to be related to the customer names as per CIS, as listed on the "valid" claims listing provided to me by FirstEnergy:


LAKE COUNT
38123 West Spauldir
Suite 20

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF ENRON ENERGY SERVIES, INC., AND FIRST ENERGY CORP., ET AL.

## DEPOSITION OF: DENISE DINE

$\qquad$ The attached transcripts) is/are being sent to you fo: filing with the Court, please return a time stamped copy of the enclosed title page in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Signature of the Deponent is required and must be signed and notarized on the Certificate where indicated; the Errata sheet must be completed, if necessary, signed and returned, along with the original executed, notarized Certificate within _ 7 days _ 30 days from the date of this memorandum. When returning the original errata sheet to C-G, please copy all counsel.

XXXX_Please contact our office to arrange a date and time for the Deponent to read and sign his/her deposition transcript here in our office. (WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF THIS LETTER.)
$\qquad$ Enclosed please find the transcript of your deposition. The Errata sheet must be completed, if necessary, signed and returned', s!o:ig with the original executed, notarized Certificate within __ 7 days $\qquad$ 30 days from receipt of this letter, or it may be filed without signature.

Cc:BENIT KAHN, ESQ.
DAVID W. HARDYMON, ESQ.
PAUL T. RUXIN, ESQ.
ARTHUR E. KORKOSZ, ESQ.

## ORIGINAB

IN THE MATTER OF
THE COMPLAINT OF
ENRON ENERGY SERVICES,
INC.,
Complainant,
and
FIRST ENERGY CORP., Case No. 01-393-EL-CSS et al.,

Respondents.

CONFIDENTIAL

Confidential deposition of DENISE DINIE, called for examination under the statute, taken beforeme, Julie A. Hascher, a Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, at the offices of vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, 2100 one Cleveland Center, Cleveland, ohio on , Tuesday, April17,2001, at 12:00 $0^{\prime} \mathrm{clock}$ p.m.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Complainant:
Vorys, sater, seymour
\& Pease, LLP, by
BENITA KAHN, ESQ.
DAVID HARDYMON, ESQ.
52 East Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
(614) 464-6400

On behalf of the witness:
Thompson, Hine \& Flory, by
JENNIFER A. LESNY FLEMING, ESQ.
3900 Key Center
127 Public Square
Cleveland, ohio 44114-1216
(216) 566-5840

On behalf of the Respondents: Jones, Day, Reavis \& Pogue, by PAUL T. RUXIN, ESQ.

901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, ohio 44114
(216)586-3939

APPEARANCES, Continued

On behalf of the Respondents:
Firstenergy, by
ARTHUR E. KORKOSZ, ESQ.
76 South Main Street Akron, ohio 44308 (330) 384-5849

DENISE DINIE, of lawful age, called for examination, as provided by the ohio Rules of Civil procedure, being by me first duly sworn, as hereinafter certified, deposed and said as follows:

EXAMINATION OF DENISE DINIE BY-MS.KAHN:
Q. Could you please state your name?
A. Denise Renee Dinie.
Q. And Ms. Dinie, I'm counsel
for Enron Energy Services and
MidAmerican Energy and I'm here with respect to a proceeding that has been filed at the public Utilities commission of Ohio related to Enron versus Firstenergy Corporation and I know that you have been deposed in another pending case, the city of Cleveland case, back in March. While they are related and have somewhat similar issues, we believe that an additional deposition was necessary.
any questions, please say so and $I$ will
assume otherwise that you've understood the question that $I$ asked unless you're asking, okay?
A. Thank you.
Q. Let's start offwith just some basic background. could you tell me your educational background, please.
A. I graduated from Mount Union College in 1992 with a bachelor's degree.
Q. And did you go any further from there?
A. Not in school, no.
Q. And what training do you have - who are you employed by?
A. I'm employed by Arthur Andersen, LLP.
Q. And could you tell me your position with Arthur Andersen?
A. I'm an audit assurance business advisory manager.
Q. Could you explain what that means, what your responsibilities are?
A. I oversee engagements for clients, anything that relates to
assurance and business advisory type engagements, and I'm the go-between between the seniors and staff individuals, which areonsiteona daily basis for the most part during engagements atclients, and the partner who would be my superior who i would report to, he is responsible for overseeing the daily activities and then reporting and consulting with the partner.
Q. Can You explain to me what an assurance type of engagement is?
A. Audits would be considered assurance type engagements, reviews, anything that individuals would be looking for some sort of responses or information from us, whetheror not that's an auditopinion, whether that's a review opinion, whether that's some sort of an agreed upon procedures report or summary.
Q. In your oversiteof these assurance agreements, I'm sorry, assurance types of engagements, do you
interact daily with the client?
A. It depends on the type of engagement.
Q. Tell me, do you have your CPA?
A. I am an exam-qualified candidate.
Q. Which means?
A. I've passed the exam, I need to take the ethics portion.
Q. How long have you been employed by Arthur Andersen?
A. Since the fall of 1992 .
Q. And that was your first job out of college, I take it?
A. First professional job, correct.
Q. Now, in getting ready for this deposition, what did you review?
A. The documents that were produced, the complaint and some of the other information that's out on the puco's web site. That's all I can recall.
Q. Have you reviewed transcripts
of other depositions?
A. I hiave not.
Q. And did you review any of the attachments to the complaint?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. Did you go back and review the stipulation that was entered into as a result of thetransition case for Eirstenergy Corporation?
A. I did not.
Q. And when I refer to the stipulation, you are aware that Firstenergy was involved in a proceeding at the Public Utilities Commission in order to comply with statutory requirements for deregulation of electricity and that the stipulation was a result of those cases?
A. I'm aware that there is a transition plan out there and a stipulation out there. I have not reviewed either of those in detail or . in total. I've seen sentences here and there, but very briefly.

> Q. And what have you reviewed
in the stipulation?
A. I don't even recall
specifically because it literally has been just a sentence here and there.
Q. And is that also true with the transition?
A. That is true.

MR. RUXIN: At this
point we would ask that the transcript be noted confidential as it appears that we're now going to be moving into the specific nature of the work that Ms. Dinie performed in this matter.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniel was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Ms. Dinie, I'm going to hand you what has been marked as Dinie Exhibit 1 . Do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. Could you tell me what that
document is?
A. This document is our engagement letter with firstenergy regarding the agreed upon procedures that we were to perform in connection with the market support generation program.
Q. And it indicates that it has been executed by I believe that is Mr. Blank, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Was Mr. Blank.the person at Firstenergy with whom you had conversations related to preparing this engagement letter?
A. One of the individuals, yes.
Q. And who else?

A: There were a few individuals within Mr. Blank's group that from time to time were involved in these discussions.
Q. And who would that be?
A. I believe Dave Headings, who was an individual that reports to Mr.

Blank, and I believe Mark Vaccaro, and

I'm not sure who Mark reports to, may have been involved in the discussions regarding this particular letter and the procedures themselves.
Q. And Mr. Vaccaro, what does he do with firstenergy?
A. I don't know his exact responsibilities.
Q. Do you know the types of responsibilities he has?
A. I know he is .- in
conjunction at least with the MSG program, he was involved with some of the programming and so forth as it relates to the web site, but that's the extent of my knowledge.
Q. Okay. Let's go back for a moment because you mentioned the MSG program, let's clarify what you mean by MSG program.
A. As it relates to my procedures, the MSG program regarding claims that were submitted, my review of the claims and then firstenergy carrying out the remainder to actually go through
an approval process.
Q. And the MSG stands for
market support generation, is that your understanding?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. And it's your understanding that the MSG is a result of the stipulation?
A. Or the transition, I'm not sure which, but yes.
Q. And that the MSG is to be made available for what purpose, do you know?
A. In order to spark the market, if you will, here in ohio to allow other marketers or brokers or aggregators to come in and to be able to competitively price energy in ohio.
Q. And how did you come about that understanding?
A. Through various discussions and the engagement letter here with -- . in preparation of the engagement letter here with firstenergy.
Q. So those would have been
discussions with Mr. Blank, is that corcect?
A. And others at the Firstenergy organization.
Q. okay. So it was correct that some were with Mr. Blank?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Who prepared the engagement letter?
A. The engagement letter is actually prepared offof a template that's provided by the firm and the information is then tailored to be specific to the exact engagement that we're working on. The template would be for an agreed upon procedures engagement, which was what this engagement was, and it's tailored.
Q. And my understanding is you do not consider this engagement to be an audit, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. What do you consider it to be?
A. It's an agreed upon
procedures engagement.
Q. And could you elaborate on that in terms of what you mean by that?
A. There are specific procedures that Arthur Anderson was asked to perform. Those are the procedures that we performed in connection this with engagement.
Q. And those are the procedures that are attached as an exhibit to this engagement letter, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, with respect to the engagement letter, on the first page it indicates that it is the understanding that the ultimate objective is to determine the validity of suppliers' claims in accordance with the protocol outlined by FirstEnergy Corp. for the suppliers, in the second paragraph in the second sentence?
A. I see that.
Q. What was your understanding of who the suppliers were with respect to suppliers' claims?
A. My understanding of who the suppliers were is any entity that was defined as an eligible supplier in the protocol.
Q. Okay. And let's for a moment -- we'll go back to that. I will hand you what's been marked as Exhibit A. Who needs a copy of the protocol?

MS. ELEMING: Sure.
Thank you.
Q. In your engagement letter in that same sentence we were referring to it says validity of the suppliers' claims in accordance with the protocol. Is Exhibit A the protocol that you believe was being referred to?
A. It appears to be the protocol. I can't say it's identical for certain, but it does appear to be.
Q. Okay. I will tell you that this was provided to us by firstenergy if that helps, or actually by counsel for firstenergy.
ago the eligible supplier and that's who you believe the supplier was in your engagement letter and if you'll turn to page 3 of the protocol, please, section 4, is it your understanding that this is how eligible suppliers were determined?
A. It's my understanding based on the definition of an eligible supplier, yes.
Q. And if you lookin 4.a it refers to marketers, brokers or aggregators not affiliated with the ohio investor owned utility. Do you know what the distinctions are between marketers, brokers and aggregators?
A. I know bits and pieces of information. I don't know that $I$ could define each and every one of them.
Q. What's your understanding of what a marketer is?
A. An entity or a company that . wished to enter the territory in order to market electricity to customers.
Q. And market in what way? How
are you using the term market?
A. To sell electricity.
Q. okay. What is your understanding of what an aggregator is?
A. An entity or a company that would have agreements with residents and/or other entities and companies where they would aggregate the electric loads for those residents, for those companies, in order to then service those individuals in connection with electricity.
Q. And what do you mean by service the individuals, what would be your understanding?
A. A contract to sell electricity to those individuals, an agreement to sell electricity to those individuals.
Q. Did you have any discussions with firstenergy or anyone from Firstenergy with. respect to the distinctions between marketers and aggregators?
A. Not as it relates to the
definitions of what the individual marketers or aggregators really means.
Q. So what discussions did you have?
A. There were some discussions in order to determine the procedures I needed to perform in conjunction with an aggregation program, for instance, for a municipal aggregator, where you had an opt out versus an actual written agreement with the individuals that were going to take part in that aggregation program.
Q. For a nonmunicipal aggregator, what conversations did you have?
A. We didn't have any specific conversations related to a nonmunicipal aggregator.

MS. KAHN: Could you read back the last part of the other answer? (Record read.)
Q. Let me go back a moment to that. When would there be an actual written agreement?
A. My understanding of the two things that we were responsible for looking at in.connection with the actual engagement is that you either have an opt out program where individuals don't necessarily have a written agreement with the entity that in this case would be making a claim for MSG on their behalf, but they go through an opt out program which would be kind of a negative confirmation, if you will, versus an actual positive confirmation as I'll call it where you do have a physical written agreement where that individual has actually signed on with an entity that's then making a claim on their behalf.
Q. And you were supposed to be reviewing contracts that were signed between the end user and what type of entities in the eligible suppliers?
A. The entity that actually made the claim for MSG.
Q. And what was your
understanding of who could make a claim
for MSG?
A. My understanding was in accordance with the protocol that eligible suppliers could make a claim for MSG.
Q. Did you have any discussions with Firstenergy on specifically the review process as it related to aggregators versus marketers?

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that?
(Record read.)
A. As it related to municipal aggregators, yes, there was a different 'process that had to be identified for municipal aggregators as compared to marketers or what $I^{\prime} m$ assuming you are referring to as a customer aggregator, because municipal aggregators utilized the opt out process and that process could not be reviewed the same as the other processes.
Q. Okay. When you are referring to customer aggregator, you were looking at section 4.d of the
protocol, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Actually $\quad$ was referring to section 4.a, aggregators, and was there ever a discussion with respect to distinctions in review processes between marketers, brokers and aggregators within section 4.a?
A. None of our procedures were split up between which section it actually related to in connection with the discussion of the procedures that we needed to perform with firstenergy.
Q. Let's stay with the protocol a little bit longer. Section 5 is titled first come first served process, initial queues.

Was the procedure that you were supposed to be performing pursuant to your engagement letter, did it involve anything with respect to section 5 ?

THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question.
(Record read.)
A. Our procedures would have reviewed some of the information that's discussed in section 5 .
Q. And what would that information be?
A. We would have reviewed some of the information in 5.d in connection with our engagement.
Q. Are you done with your answer? I didn't want to interrupt.
A. I'm not sure, give me a minute.
Q. okay.
A. I believe that's it.
Q. And what in 5.d would you have reviewed?
A. Based on.the scopes identified for us by firstenergy in connection with our engagement, we would have looked at names of customers, the so-called service agreement, if you will; count numbers for customers that ' fell within that scope, same as the names; to a limited extent the capacity being claimed; to a limited extent
whether or not the capacity claimed was claimed on a load following or a capacity factor basis and the time period for which the claim was made.
Q. Let me step back a moment. You referred to the service agrement. I assume what you are meaning to say is the generation service agreement as it's stated in the protocol?
A. That is what I referred to, but $I$ haven't went back and read the definition of the generation service agreement so I don't know jethat would equate to what we were looking at.
Q. What was your understanding of the generation service agreement?
A. I would say the way the generation service agreement is defined in the protocol is an accurate description of the understanding.
Q. And you indicated that you had reviewed the stipulation. Do you remember in the stipulation it referred to a committed capacity sale?
A. I indicated that I did not
review the stipulation, I've only looked at small sections of it in sentences of the stipulation.
Q. I'm sorry, that's correct, you said you reviewed a couple
sentences. Do you recall seeing the phrase committed capacity sale --
A. I do --
Q. -- for MSG?
A. I do recall seeing that phrase.
Q. And was that phrase explained to you by anyone?
A. I don't recall having
specific discussions of exactly what a committed capacity sale would have been defined as, but based on the general discussions that I've had with individuals from Firstenergy throughout the entire engagement, I would say that a committed capacity sale would be close to the way that the generation service ' agreement is defined here in the protocol.
Q. And how would it differ if

criteria for whether a committed capacity sale agreement existed?
A. I wouldn't say that there was a set of criteria, at least not to my knowledge. We at Arthur Andersen were responsible for identifying whether or not there was some sort of an agreement that would equate to a committed capacity sale and looking at the provisions and the terms within that agreement in order to see if there's anything that would cause us concern as to whether or not that was a binding legal document.

We then also looked at the specifics within that agreement as it relates to the service locations that that agreement was supposed to cover and some of the information as what we had discussed in section 5 under 5.d here just a few moments ago in order to make sure that claims that were submitted an'd the information underlying those claims were then supported by the information in these agreements that we were looking at.
Q. And how did you know what to look for with respect to whether there were concerns with it being a binding agreement?
A. Our procedures are outlined in the work program that's attached to our engagement letter, which is in Dinie Exhibit 1 .
Q. okay. Why don't we turn to that for a moment. When you say your procedures are laid out there, what are you referring to with respect to specifically what a committed capacity sale would be?
A. On Exhibit 1, page one, number two, it discusses access to a related written signed contract between the supplier and the customer and then it also refers to that contract in step three and then it again refers to that contract in step four on page two of that same exhibit as it relates to the specific customer information.
Q. Let's go back to number
three that you referred to on the first page of Exhibit 1 to your engagement letter. It indicates that you are to be alert for provisions that may indicate that the customer contracts are not legal binding commitments, and then in parentheses, a committed capacity sale. It then gives some instances.

Can you explain what you believed executory provisions would mean?
A. I would describe executory provisions as contingency type provisions, something had to happen before this appeared to be a legal binding commitment.

For instance, as described here, if it was simply a letter of intent but the customer hadn't actually committed to that particular supplier or if it gave the customer an option as to whether or not they wanted to commit to. that particular supplier versus them actually committing to the supplier.
Q. What other types of things
did you look for with respect to whether or not it was a binding contract?
A. These were examples of the types of provisions we would be looking for, so in reading the contracts, if there was anything else that struck me as being a potential concern as to whether or not it was a binding instrument, $I$ would have taken note of that.
Q. And then what would you do?
A. That information then would have been discussed with Firstenergy.
Q. Would you then get back to the claimant?
A. It depends.
Q. What did it depend on?
A. Whether or not $I$ was asked by Firstenergy to get back with the claimant in order to obtain additional documentation or to gain a further understanding of what that particular provision was.
Q. And who would you discuss
this with at Eirstenergy?
A. For the most part it was David Blank. There were at other times, it was discussed with individuals within his group and there were at least - there was at least one instance, maybe two, where art core cost was in the room as well.
Q. On the second page of Exhibit 1 to your engagement letter down towards the bottom, this reads to me as the scope of the review you were supposed to perform, is that correct, how many contracts you'll review, where it starts customer contracts within the following scopes have been reviewed?
A. That was the scope that we utilized in performing our work, yes.
Q. Can you explain that to me a little bit? When you say the scope, just what exactly are you meaning?
A. We were asked to review customer contracts that met these critexia.
Q. And do you recall doing a
review of Industrial Energy Users?
A. I do.
Q. Can you tell me your
understanding of who Industrial Energy Users is, your understanding?
A. My understanding is that

Industrial Energy Users is a member organization that's acting as an aggregator on behalf of its members or its customers.
Q. Are you making a distinction between members and customers there?
A. I would equate a member to a customer as it relates to my procedures.
Q. And do you recall which category IEU fell within in terms of the scope of your review?
A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean by which category.
Q. Did they fit within customer contracts with capacity claims equal or greater to l, 000 kilowatts so that you reviewed all their contracts?
A. Without looking at my notes I can't tell for certain, but $I$ believe

Industrial Energy Users would have had customers that fell within all of these categories. They would have had some customer contracts that fell within the first bullet point, they would have had some that fell within the second and some that fell within the third. That was the case for most suppliers.
Q. And when you would go out and review their claims, then how would you make the determination of how many contracts to review?
A. The determination was actually made based on these scopes.
Q. What information was given to you or how did you know what claims you would be reviewing when you went out to a supplier?
A. I wouldn't say that $I$ was actually reviewing a particular claim. I would say that $I$ was reviewing the information that was underlying the claim, because in many instances a particular claim had many customers in it and I was actually looking at the
customer contracts that would have supported the claim made on behalf of those customers.
Q. So to better understand when you say IEU had customers who fell within all the categories, did IEU have multiple contracts with each customer or each member?
A. Not to my knowledge. IEU had one contract with each customer or each member.
Q. Do you know how many members IEU has?
A. I don't know how many members in total.
Q. Do you know if all members had contracts with IEU for MSG?
A. I don't know that information, either.
Q. So what I think I'm hearing you say, correct me if I'm wrong, that while the customers for $I E U$ fell into all these categories, each customer really only had one contract with IEU, so.in reality you reviewed all the
customer contracts for each customer?
A. I did review allofthe customer contracts that IEU presented to methat day that $I$ made my visit to them. In addition, I reviewed a couple of other customer contracts that were provided to me at a later time, but 1 don't know if those were allof their customer contracts. It was enough to sufficethe work that I needed to do in connection with these scopes, but there could be other contracts out there that I didn't look at.
Q. If you didn't know how many contracts were out there, how would you know that you were in compliance with the scope?
A. Prior to my visit to any supplier, firstenergy provided me with a listing which was called a valid claims listing and is defined or described at least at the top of Exhibit 1 , page one.

That listing contained
numerous claims of that individual
supplier and showed the detailed accounts that were underneath any given claim. So each claim could have, as it says in the protocol, up to 10,000 accounts underneath it. The report Firstenergy gave to me was then sorted in a descending order by capacity claimed and that's how my selections would have been made then in accordance with these scopes.

So I had a report that showed me in descending order each account number that was claimed by the capacity that they were claiming for that particular account number. Any account numbers that would have fell within the capacity claim of being equal to or greater than 1,000 kilowatts, I would have asked to look at every single contract related to that particular account number.

Those all could have been for one customer where 1 probably would have only reviewed one contract or it could have been for numerous customers
where $I$ would have to have looked at each one of those accounts numbers which would equate to each one of those customers.

There then would have been a systematic selection to look at 33 percent of the customers equal to or greater than 200 but less than 1,000 and a systematic selection for ten percent of the customers that had capacity claims less than 200 .
Q. When you say systematic selection, what do you mean?
A. Every third account number, every tenth account number, it was just based on the record and we would count out one, two, three, let's select this one, four, five, six, select this one in order to get a 33 percent or every tenth customer in order to get a ten percent.
Q. I think I'm a little
confused so maybe you can clarify.
Maybe I'm having difficulty
understanding the distinction between
customer contracts and the claim because when you say you're counting down one, two, three, four, five, six, weren't those claims?
A. No, those were account numbers, those were customer account numbers, some of which could have resided within the same claim or some of which could have been spread cross numerous claims.

In the report Firstenergy provided to me, all the claims were mixed together and then it was sorted on a descending order by capacity claimed, and so it actually contained the account numbers of every single account that would have been claimed within all claims that had been submitted as of the date that the report had been run or a day or two before that.
Q. When you're saying account number, are you meaning the account number of the end user customer?
A. Correct. numbers with customer contracts when you're figuring out your scope, is that correct?
A. That would be correct, that's a fair way of stating it.
Q. You said earlier that you had limited involvement in the capacity claimed, and what was your involvement? I think that was back when you were discussing the protocol.
A. Originally my understanding is that we at Arthur Andersen were asked to look at the capacity claimed on behalf of a customer account in order to make certain that the supplier had a contract for that capacity. In other words, are they looking at covering the full load requirements of that particular customer.

After performing my review for one or two locations, I determined ' that most of the contracts and the way that they were written don't designate a specified capacity. They don't give you
a number. It really would say if it was a full requirements contractor an interruptible contractor something along those lines, but did not give a specific number related to the actual kilowatt capacity being claimed, and as a result, $I$ wasn't able to test that information that Firstenergy had provided to me in the reports that $I$ was looking at in order to look at customer contracts, and $I$ discussed that with Firstenergy and was told that I didn't need to actually test that number because Firstenergy had the ability to ensure that that number was reasonable with its - within its systems.
Q. So therefore you no longer tested whether the capacity in the committed capacity sale agreement was consistent with the claim?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what was your limited involvement with capacity factor or load following?
A. To the extent that a
contract indicated that a supplier was going to claim on a load following or a capacity factor basis for that particular customer, then $I$ would take note of that and make sure that that's the way they truly claimed, but in most instances there wasn't an indication.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie2 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. I think we're at Dinie 2.

I'm hoping this will help. I'm handing you Dinie Exhibit 2 and $I$ have redacted on here the customer name and the supplier, but $I$ wanted to get a better understanding of what this document is and how you made use of this type of document in the review procedure that you were involved with.
A. This document appears to be an exror report that was generated by Firstenergy and $I$ would have done very
little with this particular document with the exception of to deliver it on behalf of Firstenergy to the suppliers that $I$ visited and explain to them the types of errors and handed to them their action steps that firstenergy had prepared for them to tell them how they needed to correct those errors.
Q. As we're going across the top, do you know what the different headings mean on this report?
A. I may have an idea of what some of them mean, but $I$ may not know what allof them mean.
Q. Claim, do you know what that means?
A. That's the actual claim number that that particular account was submittedin.
Q. So it's a number created by Firstenergy as claims came in, is that correct?
A. I don't know how it was created by Firstenergy, but yes, it's a number created by Firstenergy.
Q. When you get to original account number, what would be your understanding of that?
A. My understanding of that is the account number that was actually submitted in the claim for that particular customer.
Q. And what would converted account number be?
A. My understanding of that - again this is a document created by Firstenergy, the questions are probably better directed to Firstenergy, but my understanding of that would be because Firstenergy had went through a changeover in their customer account numbers, they had to take the original account numbers and then convert them to the new customer account number to the extent that the supplier submitted the old customer account number because their systems were now mostly running offof the new customer account number so that would be the converted or new customer account number for that
particular service location.
Q. And the contract start date, do you know what that related to?
A. That was $\quad$ believe the first date for which MSG was being claimed for that particular customer, the start date of the MSG claim for that customer.
Q. Do you have any idea or how did you explain the error column because you indicated you explained what their problems were?
A. Therewas a set of standard definitions that were attached to the letter that this would have been supplied to the supplier by myselfon behalfof Firstenergy and those errors were actually explained in that standard definitions page.
Q. And do you recall if you ended up having to give an error sheet to IEU?
A. Without my notes I don't recall specifically, but it was highly unusual for any supplier not to have
any errors, so my gut reaction would be is they probably did receive one.
Q. And you said that there were standard definitions of the errors, is that correct?
A. There were standard definitions that firstenergy had provided with these letters that were to be delivered to the suppliers, yes.
Q. And did you always provide just those standard definitions with the error reports?
A. In my initial round of reviews, $I$ believe that it was those standard definitions that would have been presented to the suppliers and i believe that they were identical for each supplier, although I didn't sit and compare each and every one of them. Once suppliers had went through one round of reviews and additional claims continued to be made' that needed to be reviewed, in some instances the error definitions were not provided because the suppliers had
already seen them before. The errors were now showing up on the firstenergy web site where they had realtime interaction and didn't need one big cleanup process at the end, if you will. And so in all instances they may not have been provided each and every time $I$ had contact with a supplier regarding a review.
Q. But you didn't see any variance in the definitions that were provided?
A. I didn't specifically pay attention to whether or not there were any variances.
Q. okay. Let's step back a moment because you have referenced in the first phase - I don't think that's what you said, you called it something else, the first review process - -
A. The original round.
Q. Those were your words. Can
you just walk me through what your process was during this review period and when it started and what the rounds
were?
A. I won't recall specific
dates as to when it started. our
involvement in this engagement started back in late october. There were a few weeks of administrative contacts between myself and firstenergy in order to get the engagement letter in place and to identify the procedures that firstenergy wanted us to perform. There were some administrative contacts with numerous of the suppliers that were included in that original round of reviews, and Firstenergy then ran reports for each one of the suppliers included in that original round of reviews and those reports would be the type of reports outlined at the top of Exhibit 1 on Dinie Exhibit 1 , the very first page that talks about there was a valid listing, there was an error listing and there was a duplicate listing, I believe.
Q. And those error listings and valid listing and duplicate listings
were provided to you, is that what you're indicating?
A. The error listings and the valid listing and l believe the duplicate listing were provided to me to deliver to the suppliers. The duplicate and the error listing and the valid listing was the listing that $I$ utilized then to perform my procedures.
Q. And once you received those firstenergy reports, what did you do?
A. Over a two and a half or three week period, $I$ don't recall specifically what the time frame was, but it was sometime mid to late November, I visited with all of the suppliers included in that original round.

I delivered to them on
behalf of firstenergy the error reports and the duplicate reports and explained to them the package that contained those reports and then $I$ utilized the valid listing to perform my procedures in accordance with the scope we talked
about here a minute ago and to review the agreements in conjunction with those procedures.
Q. How was it determined what suppliers were going to be in the first round?
A. I didn't make that determination. That determination was made by Firstenergy and $I$ believe that all suppliers that had submitted claims as of a certain date when this process started were included in that original round, but $I$ can't say that for certain.
Q. Now, back at your engagement letter again for a moment, on the second page of the engagement letter it references working papers. What type of working papers were created as a result of your engagement?
A. For each supplier that $I$ visited, $I$ kept a folder of information' related to that supplier. That would include my notes from my visit, it would include some of the information
that $F i r s t E n e r g y$ provided to me, in most cases a copy of the error report and a copy of the duplicate report that was delivered to the supplier, a copy of the valid listing that $I$ worked off of to show the contracts that were selected or the account numbers that were selected for review, contact information related to that supplier, business cards, just about anything that related to my review of that particular supplier would be included in those folders.

That information was then
all utilized to prepare a sumary of my review for the individual suppliers and that summary was the information that was then shared with firstenergy to discuss my review of the suppliers, at least for the original round.

The working papers
themselves when this project is complete will probably not contain all of that information, but being that this has been an ongoing project since November, they haven't actually been put together
in a filing format.
Q. When you said that at least for the original round, were you meaning that you only prepared a sumary for the original round? I wasn't quite sure what you were referring to there.
A. In many instances that's the case, because after the original round, things came in so piecemealed because it wasn't that $I$ did one six or eight hour review at an individual supplier and then was able to summarize that. It might have been that $I$ took 15 minutes or 45 minutes one day and looked at this piece and two days later I received another piece that supported another account and looked at it, so those types of things were reported to Firstenergy more on a realtime basis.
Q. And that was a verbal report?
A. Yes, versus actually putting them in a written format.
Q. How would you note that you had made that verbal report?
A. I don't know that I would have noted anywherethat t had actually made that verbal report other than for the most part they were done in pieces, that there were certain dates or times that we sat down and I went through everything that $I$ had been through to date no matter what supplier that it related to.
Q. When you say at certain times we sat down, who is the we?
A. For the most part it was myself and David Blank. To a lesser extent, some individuals within his department, $I$ would sitwith them sometimes and summarize the information and they would then report it to Dave. Some of those pieces would be documented by individuals at Firstenergy.

Sometimes they had put together summaries of the discussions that we had had and so forth.
Q. So if you didn't have the discussion with Dave Blank, then you may have it with someone else who would discussion with Dave Blank, then you may
make notes of your meeting or sumarize the meeting, is that what you were just saying in terms of document?
A. I think the individuals that I talked with, if I recall correctly, had documented some information as we were discussing so that they could then relay that information to Dave Blank.
Q. Do you remember who those people would have been?
A. The only individual $I$ can recall for sure is David Headings. From time to time Mark Vaccaromay have been in the room, but there was never a point that $I$ reported directly to Mark without either David Headings or David Blank being present that $I$ can recall.
Q. Now, the impression $I$ got is that you had specific dates that you sat down with Dave Blank and you went over all the reviews that you had done up to that point?
A. I wouldn't say specific
dates. I would say at a convenient time, whenever that might have been, we
sat down and went through everything that $I$ hadn't previously reported but that $I$ had completed my review on up until that particular point or at least gave him an update as to where we were at in conjunction with my review.
Q. Did you provide him with a written summary?
A. For the original reviews, I produced to him a witten sumary, which he then returned to me at the end of that review in order to use it as an outline for that discussion.

Subsequent to that point
in time $I$ don't recall specifically providing to him written summaries, although there could have been from time to time things that $I$ pointed to and had him read.
Q. So you would bring documents that he may look at, but you would take those back with you, is that correct?
A. That's correct, because these were all in process reviews and the intention was that the documents would
continue to be added to.
Q. Was there an intention at
the end there would be a written summary that would summarize each supplier?
A. For our working papers, yes, there will be a written sumary that will summarize each supplier.
Q. And will that be provided to Firstenergy?
A. That's Firstenergy's option as it's established in the engagement letter.
Q. So what $I$ believe you're referring to is on the first page, the first paragraph under Andersen's responsibilities and limitations, the last sentence, if you request a written report, is that the written report you were referring to that they could request at the end?
A. That's correct.
Q. And without that you will
leave nothing in writing with them?
A. Unless they request specific
pieces in writing.
Q. Have you provided any written report to Firstenergy with respect to IEU?
A. IEU's written report would have been shared with Firstenergy at the time that we discussed the resultsof my initial round of review of allof the suppliers, but that would have been the reports that were given to David Blank to use as an outlinefor our discussion that hethen returned to me at the end of that discussion.
Q. Do you know with respect to IEU if You had conversations withothers at Firstenergy who documented those discussions?
A. I don't recall specifically if IEU would have been included in any of those conversations or not. I may be able to better determine if $I^{\prime} m$ looking at allof my notes, but m don't recall specifically ifthey were. There's a possibility they could have been.
Q. Now, you indicated that this engagement letter is sort of a form letter of Arthur Andersen's that you then adjust for the particular client, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what is the -- what would you consider to be the normal procedure -- you call these a -- tell me again the phrase.
A. An agreed upon procedure engagement.
Q. I'm going to write that down. In an agreed upon procedure engagement - strike that. Based on the description that you indicated to me at the beginning of your responsibilities with Arthur Andersen, I assume you are regularly involved in agreed upon procedure engagements, is that correct?
A. I don't know how you would define regularly. I've performed several agreed upon procedures in my career in various circumstances, but
it's not - agreed upon procedures usually are not normal securing procedures.
Q. And how many would you say you've been involved in?
A. I would say somewhere in the ten to 12 range.
Q. Is it your experience with those other agreed upon procedure engagements that written reports were not provided?
A. In some cases written reports were not provided and in others they were.

MS. FLEMING: When it's convenient for you, I would suggest maybe a five minute break.

MS. KAHN: Now's fine. (Recess had.)

BY MS. KAHN:
Q. Ms. Dinie, once again going back to your limited role in determining capacity factor and load following, what was that? You may have answered that, I just don't remember what your answer
was as to what your role was.
A. I did answer it. Are you referring to --
Q. You indicated in the protocol, section 5, that you had some limited involvement in your procedures on the load following and capacity factor issue. Could you tell me what that involvement was?
A. Yes.
Q. And I apologize.
A. To the extent that any of the agreements that $I$ was looking at made specific reference that a supplier was to claim on behalf of a customer on a load following basis or a capacity factor basis, $I$ would take note of that and exchange that information with Firstenergy or made sure that the claim was made on that particular basis, but for the most part there wasn't a distinguishment in the majority of the' contracts that $I$ looked at.
Q. So it was really just
focusing on whether the contract between
the supplier and the end user referenced load following or capacity factor and if it did, you would note that, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And do you recall if any of the IEU contracts indicated capacity factor or load following?
A. I don't recall.
Q. When you were preparing to go out and do these reviews, what did you look at? Did you look at the stipulation?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at the supplemental materials to the stipulation?
A. I don't know what those materials would be, but probably not.
Q. That's probably a no. Did you look at the Ohio Revised Code --
A. No.
Q. -- with respect to
electrical deregulation? Did you look at the Public Utilities Commission's
rules?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at any information provided by firstenergy explaining the protocol?
A. I don't recall specifically if any of the information explained the protocol, but I did look at the protocol itself and also looked at several presentations that my understanding was prepared by Firstenergy and shared with the suppliers at various meetings that firstenergy had with the suppliers dating back to possibly July of 2000 or so.
Q. And those presentations that you reviewed, did you then get back to Firstenergy with questions?
A. I believe I had a few questions on them.
Q. Do you remember what those ' questions related to?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. Did you have any involvement
in - let me go back. Strike that.
If you'll pull out your
protocol once again, that would be
Exhibit A. If you would turn to section 6, approval process, and 1 will limit this to 6.a for the moment.

Would you please tell me what specific sections of 6.a your procedure was involved with?

THE WITNESS: May I have
the question reread, please.
(Record read.)
A. I would have had some
involvement with the second item under 6.a with two little $\mathrm{I}^{\prime}$ 's in identifying whether or not - not whether or not the customer accounts and the customer names matched, but whether or not the customer name that was submitted in accordance with the claim matched the customer that came out of the Firstenergy customer information system.

And I would have had some involvement with little little l,
which is the fourth step under there in reading the contract that the supplier had with the retail customer and looking at the duration to make sure the duration in that contract matched the duration that the claim was made for.
Q. Is that all?
A. That'sit.
Q. Therefore you had no
involvement with respect to registration of the utility, or with the utility, I'm sorry.
A. That's correct.
Q. Or verification that the supplier was a CRES?
A. That's correct.
Q. Certified retail electric supplier, sorry. And you're saying with respect to 6.a, small Roman numeral 4, the only thing that you would have been looking at was the duration of the contract or are you saying your review. process actually was broader, you also were making sure there was a committed capacity sale? broader than that in accordance with the agreed upon procedures. I was reading those contracts to identify whether or not there were any provision in there that would cause me concern as to whether there was a legal binding Document.
Q. In 6.a small Roman numeral 4 there is also a parenthetical that says or an alternative form of verification. Can you explain what your understanding of that was?
A. I don't have an understanding of that. In my opinion there wasn't any type of an alternative form of verification that ever came up that I needed to look at.
Q. Okay. Let's move to section 6.b of the protocol, and once again would you please tell me which provisions of $6 . b$ your procedures were involved with and how?
A. My procedures would have contained limited involvement in number

3 under 6.b, again in looking at the customer name that was submitted by the supplier within a claim and comparing it to the customer name that came out of the firstenergy customer information system, and $I$ would have spoke with the suppliers then regarding those to make sure that they knew who they were actually claiming on behalf of, but would not have had any other involvement under that particular number.

I would have looked at the contract duration under little $B$ little II, which is 7 under 6.b. I would not have determined if there was an actual contract, though, but $I$ would have brought to firstenergy's attention if there were any provisions that caused me concern.
Q. Okay. Do you know who would have made the determination whether or not there was a contract?
A. Firstenergy would have made that determination.
Q. Do you know who specifically
at Firstenergy?
A. I believe David Blank would have made that determination initially, but I don't know who all he would have consulted with. I do know one instance he definitely consulted with somebody else at Firstenergy.
Q. Do you know who that other person was?
A. In this particular instance that I'm aware of it was Leila Vespoli.
Q. And do you know if that had to do with IEU?
A. It did not have to do with IEU.
Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Blank needed to make a determination on whether or not a contract existed with respect to IEU's claims?
A. There were items that $I$ had discussed with Mr. Blank that resulted from my review in connection with IEU that $I$ had brought to his attention, and what kind of determinations he actually made from that point, I don't
know.
Q. And what were the items that you discussed with Mr. Blank with respect to IEU?
A. I don't recall them specifically. I would need to have my notes in front of me.
Q. Okay. Going back to the protocol for a moment where it says in small Roman numeral 7, 6.b, small Roman numeral 7 , page 8 of 10 , it indicates if $F E$ determines that at the time of application an eligible supplier did not have a contract, I assume that you were involved with that aspect as well, is that correct?
A. What are you assuming my involvement would be?
Q. Determining whether or not there was a - not whether or not there was a contract, but whether or not there was a concern of the contract existing at the time of application.
A. Yes, I would have been
involved in discussing with firstenergy
if there was a concern as to whether or not a contract existed.
Q. And what does at the time of application mean to you?
A. My understanding basedon the information that Firstenergy gave me in giving me directions is that at the time of application would nave meant at the time that the particular claim was submitted for that customer or that customer account.
Q. And do you recall whether there were concerns raised with respect to IEU not having a contract at the time of application?
A. I don't recall positively without having my notes in front of me.
Q. okay. I want to hand you Dinie Exhibit 3 .
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie3 was
marked for purposes of identification. but does this - is this a form that looks familiar to you?
A. It does.
Q. And how did you make use of this form?
A. My use of this form was only to give me an idea of what suppliers needed to be reviewed next and what claims of those suppliers needed to be reviewed next. This is a document that's prepared by firstenergy that I only had limited access to.
Q. This is not the document that you were referring to when you said you would get all the claims and that's what you would count down?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Okay. And when you said you would use this to determine what suppliers you needed to review, how would you make that determination from ' this document?
A. And I should preface that by
saying that this was after the original
round of my reviews. Theoriginal round of my reviews were done on a first comefirst served basis. The suppliers were all contacted by Firstenergy and told that firstenergy was implementing its right to move forward with this process, that they needed to get in touch with me and schedule a date with me within a specified period of time and those suppliers were then scheduled by contacting me on first come first served basis.

After that initial
scheduling was done and the particular claims were looked at in connection with that original round, I then used this to give me an idea of who was up next in the so-called queue as it's referred to to determine who was going to need to be looked at next in conjunction with firstenergy.
Q. So in other words, of the MSG that was left after you did the first round, who may be potentially in
line to receive that MSG, is that correct?
A. Thlat is correct.
Q. And so you used this to decide going down in that order who to do the next review or reviews?
A. Yes. The decision wasn't all mine, but we used this as a discussion point to say we need to do this supplier next and this supplier next.
Q. When you say the discussion, who did you have those discussions with?
A. Between myself and Firstenergy, primarily David Blank.
Q. And under the column that's listed as status code, do you recall what would be in that column?
A. Without seeing what's actually in that column, I don't recall what that stands for.
Q. We're done with that one. - - - -
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie4 was

your understanding that those retail contracts would be executed between a buyer and a seller of MSG, is that correct?
A. My understanding is that those contracts would be executed between the entity that claimed the MSG and its customer or end user.
Q. And if you had to designate them as buyer and seller, how would you do that, those two entities?
A. I ve never had to make that designation, but the end user would be the buyer and then you've got a claimant.
Q. Who in your mind would be the seller?
A. May or may not be the seller. I've never had to make that determination.
Q. Why are you hesitating with the may or may not?
A. There are certain claimants
that have established a customer relationship that $I$ 'm unaware of whether
or not they're actually the, quote, seller as you're calling it. I guess I would need for you to define for me what you mean by seller.

MS. KAHN: Could you read that answer back.
(Record read.)
Q. Let me just ask you, when you say claimants have established a customer relationship, what type of customer relationships did you see in your review?
A. You've got aggregation customer relationships, you've got direct contract customer relationships. Those are the only two 1 can recall.
Q. What do you mean by direct contract relationship?
A. That there's a positive confirmation as referred to it before where there's an actual written agreement between the claimant of the MSG and the customer.
Q. And when you're referring to aggregation, are you once again
referring to the municipal opt out aggregation that we had discussed earlier?
A. Yes, and there are other entities that are aggregating that have claims in that they wouldn't necessarily have to have an aggregation with an opt out for - based on my understanding in order to make that claim.
Q. And you see that as a different customer relationship than a direct contract?
A. That's probably a fair statement.
Q. And where do you see the distinction?
A. For instance, a municipal aggregator could make a claim on behalf of its own city load and there obviously wouldn't be an opt out process because that municipal aggregator was the individual entity that made the claim.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. And the decision would have
been based on budgetary reasons or whatever their reasons were, but they're not going to have to go through a contracting stage with its own city load.
Q. What about nonmunicipal aggregators?
A. Nonmunicipal aggregators would have had to have had something, whether that be through an opt out process, which $I$ 'm not aware of any, but it would have had to have had something in an agrement format with its end use customers, not to say that it couldn't be through an opt out process.
Q. Would the aggregator as a seller take title to the MSG, do you know?
A. That $I$ don't know.
Q. Okay. You indicated that there was a second round and $I$ want to hand you Dinie 5 .

IThereupon, Deposition

potentially even the thirdor fourth round to the extent necessary. I don't recall specifically which round or rounds, but it definitely was not the first.
Q. Going to the third paragraph, when you are addressing the contracts that you're going to review, you've specifically stated that you do not want them to redact the paragraph headers, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I assume You mean -well, why don't you tell me what you meant by that.
A. A paragraph header would be a description similar to if you go back to the protocol and it says section 1 , purpose of document, so it would be the description of what's going to be contained beneath that particular provision or beneath that particular section.
Q. And were the contracts that you reviewed in this second round, did
they have headers in all cases?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. What provisions were you
looking for with those headers?
A. Since $I$ had been through the original round or the initial round of my reviews and $I$ had reviewed contracts for the most part in unredacted form at some point in time in connection with that initial round, I was really looking for consistency to see if all the contracts were similar to the ones that I had reviewed before or if there were additional provisions that $I$ may now need to take a look at in connection with the second round or the third round or the fourth round.
Q. And were those provisions that you were concerned about those that might contain contingencies?
A. I would have been concerned with provisions that again could impact or could bear upon the fact of whether or not there was a legal binding document.
Q. And what type of provisions would you have focused on in that fegard?
A. Anything that would have caused concern as to whether or not there was a legal binding document.
Q. Do you recall specific neading titles that concerned you?
A. No, I can't formulate a specific title from a contract.
Q. Do you recall whether or not there were contingencies in the $I E U$ contracts that you reviewed?
A. I recall what $I$ consider to be one contingency in the IEU contract. That's not to say that may or may not have been the only one, but it specifically comes to my mind.
Q. What was that?
A. Within the contract between IEU and its customers, there was a provision that indicated that another agreement had to be executed in substantially the same form as the draft that was attached to that contract
between IEU and its customers.
Q. Let me go back a minute.

When you were looking at the IEU contract between IEU and their customers, was there one form contract that was used for all their members for MS G?
A. The best that $I$ can recollect, yes, there was one form.
Q. And so this was the contract - the form that you reviewed had a contingency, if $I^{\prime} m$ hearing you correctly, that said you also have to execute the agreement that's attached to this form contract, is that correct?
A. It didn't say you, but it said that the attached agreement had to be executed and I don't recall who had to execute it.
Q. And do you recall what the attached agreement was?
A. The attached agreement was. an agreement between IEIJ and Firstenergy Services.

> Q. Didithave a title?
A. I have an acronym for it and I don't know if this is the exact title, but $I$ believe it was the master services -- master services agreement or something along those lines.
Q. Okay. Firstenergy Services, could you explain who that is?
A. Firstenergy Services is a subsidiary of firstenergy Corporation.
Q. And what does Firstenergy Services do?
A. Based on other knowledge of the company, firstenergy Services -based on my other knowledge of the company, Firstenergy Services is on the nonregulated side of the corporation and is kind of the parent company for many of the nonregulated activities that Firstenergy is involved in.
Q. Did you review the master services agreement?
A. I did read the master services agreement.

MS. FLEMING: I think you
need to listen to the question. I'm
not sure she understood the question, if you could read it back.
(Record read.)
MS. FLEMING: I can
interject here --
A. No. I read the draft of the master services agreement that was attached to one of the contracts between IEU and its customer.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. But I did not review an executed copy of the master services agreement.
Q. Did you inquire with IEU as to whether or not the master services agreement was executed by the customer?
A. I did make that inguiry.
Q. And?
A. And I'll preface that by saying $I$ don't recall who the master services agreement had to be executed by. I don't know if it was by the customer, $I$ don't recall that, but $I$ did make the inquiry as to whether or not it had been finalized and executed
and the answer was no, it had not at that point in time.
Q. And.were you later advised that it had been?
A. No.
Q. And did you point out this contingency to Firstenergy?
A. I did.
Q. Did you also advise Firstenergy that you were unable to confirm if it had ever been executed?
A. At the time that I reported my summary to Fixstenergy, I said to the best of my knowledge there was not an executed document out there, yes.
Q. Did you request that IEU get back to you to supplement whether or not it was ever executed?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you review the
unexecuted -- the draft master services agreement in your initial round?
A. I did.
Q. And was that part of your summary report with respect to IEU? don't recall specifically without seeing my summary report.
Q. Was your summary report typed generally or was it handwritten?
A. For the initial round the summary report was typed.
Q. Okay. Do you recall
discussing the master services agreement with Mr. Blank?
A. I recall discussing the concerns that i had regarding the contingency that it hadn't been executed and it was still in draft form and it was still with Firstenergy Services with Mr. Blank. I don't know that I
specifically discussed any provisions within the master services agreement with him.
Q. Do you recall what Mr.

Blank's reaction was?
A. I don't recall specifically:
Q. Do you recall if Mr. Blank gave you further instructions with respect to the master services
agreement?
A. I recall two items being raised that he had asked me to follow up on, but $I$ don't recall if there were actually any additional instructions other than those two follow-up items.
Q. And what were those follow-up items?
A. I may not recall these verbatim, but one was to determine the exact wording within the contract between IEU and its customers related to the master services agreement, and the second item was actually a follow-up that $I$ think firstenergy had made for itself or Mr. Blank had made for itself in connection with something along the lines of customer credit arrangements. (Record read.)
Q. okay. With respect to the exact wording, did you follow up on that?
A. I did.
Q. And can you elaborate on
that?
A. I was asked to follow up on something along the lines of whether or not the contract between IEU and its customers were worded that the master services agreement had to be executed or if it had to be executed in substantially the same form as the attached draft.
Q. And what was the result of that?
A. The wording was that it had to be executed in substantially the same form.
Q. Was there any other instruction with respect to follow-up on wording?
A. I don't recallany others.
Q. Did Mr. Blank explain to you the relevance or the distinction between those two phrases?
A. No.
Q. Or why it was significant to him?
A. No.
Q. With respect to the customer
credit arrangements, I'm not quite sure I understand what that is. Can you explain that more?
A. I don't recall specifically what it was without my notes either.
Q. Okay. What customer are you referring to, the customer of Firstenergy or the end user customer, the retail customer, do you know?
A. What customer am referring to - -
Q. For the customer credit arrangement, $I^{\prime} m$ sorry.

MR. RUXIN: $\quad I^{\prime} m$ sorry,
could you read the question back? I just lost the thread.
(Record read.)
A. I don't know what customer it would have been.
Q. Did you do follow-up on the customercredit arrangement?
A. I did not. That was a
follow-up point firstenergy had made for itself.
Q. So it would be your
Q. so it would be your
testimony that the only contingency in the IEU contract that you reviewed for committed capacity sale was the requirement with respect to the master services agreement, is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Would you reread that question, please?
(Record read.)
A. That's the only contingency that $I$ can recall without my notes in front of me.
Q. You indicated with respect to Dinie Exhibit 5 that this form letter went out after the first round of reviews, is that correct? Let me rephrase that. Did not go out for the first round of reviews, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. When you were preparing to go out for your first round of reviews, how did you advise those suppliers who you were going to review what you wanted to be looking at?
A. The suppliers were primarily advised through the letter that came
from Mr. Blank that you've given to me in Dinie Exhibit 4 that they were to get in contact with me in order to schedule this review and that we would be looking for the written agrements or the contracts between the claimants and their customers.
Q. When you got in touch with them, did you give them more detail as to what you wanted to see?
A. I didn't specifically have a prepared speech to give them, but if questions were asked, I tried to answer them.
Q. Did you have discussions with IEU as to what you were going to want to review?
A. Not that $I$ can recall.
Q. And during your review at IEU, who did you work with on behalfof IEU?
A. There were two individuals that $I$ primarily worked with and there was a third individual that assisted with taking my coat and gathering some
information or collecting documents or making copies or whatever.
Q. Who were those people?
A. The two that $I$ primarily worked with was Sam Randazzo and Kevin, I think it's murray.
Q. Okay. You're doing better than $I$ would do. Were both Mr.
Randazzo and Mr. Murray present at your review in the initial round?
A. At various points in time auring my review they were both present.
Q. And did you ask questions of both of them?
A. I don't recall specifically if it was one or both of them that $I$ asked questions of.
Q. Did you ask questions with respect to the master services agreement?
A. I did inquire with respect to the master services agreement as to ' whether or not it had been executed and finalized.
Q. Did you have other questions
with respect to the master services agreement?
A. I don't recall without my notes.
Q. You indicate in this format letter, Dinie Exhibit 5, that you're going to want to review pricing. What was it that you needed to review with respect to pricing arrangements?
A. I don't believe that I specifically say in here that $\mathrm{I}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}$ going to want to review pricing. I think it says to be sure that all attachments are included.
Q. That identified the specifics of the contract such as the locations covered andfor the pricing arrangements.
A. Right. I'm looking to make sure that all attachments are included in the information that's provided to me so that $I$ don't have the follow-up question to have to go back and ask for attachments.
Q. But if you wanted to make sure the attachments for pricing were
included, $I$ would assume you were going to look at the pricing, is that correct?
A. No, that's not correct. I could care less what they're pricing the electricity at, to be honest.
Q. So then why were you concerned that the attachment with respect to pricing was there?
A. Because in some cases there were certain suppliers that the way their contract was written was that the contract was not a contract until the pricing attachments had been signed by the customers and $I$ needed to make sure I saw those attachments in signed format before $I$ could say that yes, you've -there's nothing here that causes me any concern.
Q. Do you recall if there was a pricing concern with respect to IEU?
A. Since $I$ wasn't interested in the pricing, $I$ don't know $I$ would say that there was a pricing concern. I don't recall that IEU had any pricing
attachments.
Q. Do you recall if IEU's
contract was redacted?
A. IEU's contract between itself and its customers were not redacted.
Q. Do you recall if the IEU contracts gave the customer the right to terminate?
A. I don't recall positively without my notes.
Q. How many visits did you make to IEU?
A. One physical visit to them.
Q. And do you recall how long you were there approximately?
A. Somewhere in the five or six hour range, maybe seven.
Q. And do you recall how many contracts you reviewed approximately?
A. Probably somewhere close to 20.
Q. I'm correct that you previously testified that all the contracts were the same however, is that correct, in terms of the form of the
contract between IEU and its members?
A. That's correct.
Q. So when you're saying 20
contracts, that would be between IEU and
an individual member of IEU, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to clarify that each contract - each of those 20
contracts would reflect an agreement between IEU and one of its members?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. In the preparation of your summary reports, did you allow the claimants to review those summary reports?
A. I did not permit the claimants to review those summary reports unless obtained permission from Firstenergy.
Q. And how would that come about, the permission?
A. Because Arthur Andersen was. engaged by Firstenergy and this is an agreed upon procedures engagement, our review and summary information goes to

Firstenergy because they're the individuals that have engaged us: to perform this work, so we report to Firstenergy and in accordance with firm standards $I$ 'm not permitted to report that information to anyone else except for Eirstenergy unless i have Firstenergy's permission to do so.
Q. And I assume therefore claimants didmake the request and you had requested permission, is that. correct?
A. Some claimants made the request.
Q. Did IEU?
A. They did not.

MS. KAHN: I need about a three minute break.
(Recess had.)
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie 6 was
marked for purposes
of identification.
(arstenergy'spermissionto do so. request
Q.Did and for the record we are now going through the documents that were produced by Ms. Dinie as part of her subpoena duces tecum and these were produced this morning to us.

I have marked as Exhibit 6 documents that were Bates stamped one through 12 if it would help, and first can you explain to me what this is?
A. This is a document that was prepared by firstenergy and my understanding is that it was a sumary Of all of the claims that firstenergy had approved as of certain dates.
Q. And why was it provided to you?
A. For my information.
Q. Did you.in any way confirm that these approved claims were consistent with your belief that your review had been completed for a claim?
A. I did not take this document after it had been provided to me and look at the claims that were on it and
compare to see whether or not my review was completed, no.

But prior to this document being created, I do know that there were discussions that took place between myself and Mr. Blank regarding numerous claims.
(Record read.)
Q. And when you're indicating prior to this document being created, is that because you knew what was going to go into the document so you were concerned about specific claims?
A. I knew what claims we had talked about. I didn't know what was going to go into the document or how they were going to summarize it internally, no.
Q. So your reference to having numerous conversations with Mr. Blank with respect to claims, is that a reference to the summaries that you would provide to Mr. Blank?
A. Not only the summaries that I would provide to Mr. Blank, but also
other conversations that $I$ had had with him at various times in order to discuss the process and where we were at and what I had completed and so forth from the last time that we had had such a discussion.
Q. So you would report to Mr.

Blank, as far as I'm concerned my review is completed of these claims, listing specific claims, is that correct?
A. In some cases, yes. In other cases, it was an inquiry that was made as to looking at the queue and looking at Mr. Blank or someone at Firstenergy would be looking at the queue and would be looking at the next claims in line and ask me, have you looked at this one, where are we at with this one.
Q. So it was somewhat of an informal process that you would report. your conclusion of your review?
A. After the initial round, that's correct.
Q. okay. I think I need to better understand the initial round. A. Because the initial round all took place within a short time period and that's basically all I was doing was jumping from one supplier to another to make my visits and to perform my reviews, all of that information was summarized and discussed with Mr. Blank in one sitting.
Q. Okay.
A. Subsequent to that point in time, information was requested and was gathered more on a piecemeal basis because $I$ didn't make second and third visits to a lot of the suppliers and it was just on an as-needed basis that information was requested from them and it was provided to me then based on their schedules, and as a result my discussions with Mr. Blank were more sporadic as $I$ had completed something or as he had inquired about something. Q. All I'm trying to distinguish so $I$ can understand this,
the first round from what I'm
understanding you would consider when you went out to each supplier's location and you did a report on all those visits. The second round may include follow-up information that resulted from the first round or would you include that as part of your first round?
A. It could be both. I don't recall specifically whether my contacts were made as it relates to follow-up information from the first round. In some cases it might have been that the inquiries that resulted from my first round that Eirstenergy then asked me to go back and do additional follow-ups on were provided to the suppliers at the same time that their listing for their second round was provided, and in other situations it may have been that there was an interim communication that took' place.
Q. When you had this meeting with Mr. Blank to go over all the
results of the first round, it didn't necessarily mean that you had concluded your review of every one of those claims, is that correct?
A. That's correct, because there were follow-up points that came out of that.
Q. If you would turn to page, what's Bates stamped as 3 , do you know what the numbers mean with respect to IEU, the 170 and the 6.4 going across?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Could you turn to page 6.
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. The line across for IEU that starts with 170.7 , do you understand what the losses column at the top means?
A. This was prepared by Firstenergy. It's probably a question better directed to them.
Q. Okay. Do you recall whether or not this was broken out by operating company? not positive.
Q. Okay. Bates number 7,
please. I assume once again this was a Firstenergy prepared document, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. There is down at the bottom, approval subject to Firstenergy registration, Fes question mark. Do you know what that means?
A. I don't know positively.
Q. Do you have any idea?
A. The approval subject to $E E$ registration $I^{\prime} m$ guessing is that Eirstenergy needed to make sure that reU had registered with them.

My understanding is that Firstenergy required a separate registration process in order for suppliers to submit claims and I'm guessing that that's what that means.

FES is an acronym that is used for Firstenergy Services, but why it has the question marks and why it's
there, I'm not positive.
Q. Going over where it says subsequent claims subject to auditor review, megawatt values subject to review, do you know those two phrases mean?
A. Again, $I$ don't know positively, but $I$ do know that at various times when they put together these summaries, the claims that were being listed here for approval weren't necessarily the only claims that any particular supplier had in at that given point in time, but they were only the claims that $I$ had been through my process and firstenergy had been through all of its processes on and plus those were the only claims that they were ready to approve is my understanding at that point in time. So there were subsequent claims that would have come in that $I$ needed to go through my process on and that firstenergy potentially maybe needed to go through their process on.
Q. And their process would be the approval process?
A. Their process was more than just the approval process and $I$ don't know what all was entailed in their process, but their process started at the very beginning in looking to make sure that customers that were submitted within a claim was actually a firstenergy customer, that it was submitted within a claim under a firstenergy company that serviced that customer, that it was a valid customer account number, that it was an active customer account, the capacity that was claimed matched what they had in their system as being a reasonable amount for that capacity that was claimed, whether or not there were any duplicates.

It was kind of an ongoing
process all the way from beginning to end. So their additional review after I performed mine, they had to take additional steps to make sure if there were any follow-ups that they needed to
take care of and any additional
administrative items that needed to be taken care of before they approved claims. That was my understanding of how they went about it.
Q. Do you have any idea what the 8.933 remains in queue due to megawatt limit means?
A. I could guess what that means, but $I$ don't know positively.
Q. What would your guess be?
A. My guess would be that after one of these claims, and l'm guessing it would be the $O E$ one since it stands next to it, after that claim was approved, that that was the amount that was remaining in the queue at that point in time based on these figures due to the fact that there was a limitation on the megawatts that each subsidiary company of firstenergy was offering in conjunction with the transition or stipulation.

MS. KAHN: Okay. I know
this is somewhat out of order, but it
is Bates stamped number 90 through lol.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie7 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)

MS. KAHN: For your records, it's Dinie No. 7 now.
Q. Ms. Dinie, do you recall receiving this email from Mr. Blank?
A. There's a couple of them, and yes, $I$ recall receiving them, although I'm not sure how or where 100 and 101 fit in.
Q. Okay. We might be better offif we broke this up, for 90 and 91 to be Dinie Exhibit 7, Bates stamp 90 and 91 .

Just to make this easier,
is it your understanding that Bates stamps number 92 through 99 go together', that that was the attachment to the email?
A. I believe that's the case,

there, or looking at there.
Q. Is it your understanding that once something showed up on the attached table that would be an indication that your review process had been completed?
A. I don't know that $I$ can say that for certain because $I$ did not see these attachments prior to the time that they were distributed.
Q. Do you recall if you were still involved in a review process with IEU at the time that this approved claim attachment was provided, so as of December $21 s t$ ?
A. I would have completed my initial round of my review of IE e as of this date, at least $I$ believe that $I$ would have. There could have been second or third rounds that may or may not have been completed, I don't recall the specific timing, and I don't know. what claims specifically that these particular lists would entail for $I E U$ and whether or not they were included
in my firstor secondround.
Q. Do you recall that you mentioned there were two follow-up items raised with the IEU contract? Had those been resolved by December 21 st that you're aware of?
A. The first item, which would have been the item that $I$ was asked to follow up on, would have been resolved. The second item I'm not certain because I believe that was a firstenergy follow-up.
Q. On Dinie 6 the very first page --

MS. FLEMING: Bates one through 12.
Q. - at the top it indicates IEU approved claims with CEI, claim number 1756.

When you turn to Bates stamp number 2, does that indicate the amount of IEU claim number 1756 in terms of megawatts, do you know?
A. I don't know that
positively. I didn't prepare this.
Q. Okay. Can you turn back to page 7 again, the Bates stamp?
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. And you'll note that that's claim numbers 55, 61 and 68 for $1 E U$. would that reflect that there are other claims within there such as 1756, do you know?
A. Other claims within where?
Q. Within those claim numbers. That the total megawatts, for instance, for CEI is 30.055 , yet the megawatts on page 1 of the Bates stamp for IEU and CEI is . 762 . Do you know how those two numbers work together by any chance?
A. I don't know and I don't know that they do work together.
Q. okay. So you don't know if these. 76 is incorporated within the 30.055?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Bates stamp number 101.
(Thereupon, Deposition

Exhibit-9 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q.. Up at the top it says summary of claim review with Denise Dinie 11/11/2001. One would have to assume that's a typo?

MR. RUXIN: This is
Bates stamp--
MS. KAHN: 101 .
MR. RUXIN: And it's
Dinie No. 9?
MS. KAHN: Eight.
MS. FLEMING: ISn't it 9?
MS. KAHN: It is 9, sorry.
Q. Do you recall why this document was provided to you?
A. I can guess that it was for my information.
Q. And the November 11, 2001 , do you recall if you had a review meeting November 11 th of 2000?
A. I doubt there would have been a review meeting November 11 th of

2000 because if I recall correctly, that would have been before any of my visits would have even taken place.
Q. And this would have been provided to you for what reason, do you remember?
A. For my information, Firstenergy provided it. It wasn't something that $I$ asked for. I don't know why they would have.
Q. Did you use it at allin your review process?
A. $\quad \mathrm{N} \circ$.
Q. Did you put it in the file for the claimant?
A. It would have contained numerous claimants, and no, it just would have went in my general file.
Q. Okay.
A. If I even had a hard copy. It might have just been saved in an email.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinielo was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Let me mark as Dinie Exhibit 10 Bates stamps number 112 through 117 . Can you identify what these documents are?
A. I believe these documents are copies of the ASCII files that were uploaded into the Firstenergy web site, but I don't recall for which supplier.
Q. And these were ASCII files that you obtained when you were out doing the review, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So what would the numbers designate on this?
A. I don't know that positively. My guess would be it's the capacity claimed.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniell was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Dinie Exhibit ll, which is Bates stamped number 118 , do you recall how this document was provided to you?
A. This was also a document prepared by Firstenergy. I believe I was copied on an email that contained this document.
Q. And it indicates problems identified during audit. Would those be problems that you identified in your review process?
A. That would be correct, although I don't know that it would be limited to that, if $I$ were to see all the unredacted information or all of the redacted information.
Q. What else could be on here?
A. I don't remember.
Q. okay. Let me step back a moment. When you were redacting, what were you focusing on with respect to your redaction?

MS. FLEMING: I can
interject and say that we redacted other
suppliers and customer names and account numbers.

MS. KAHN: OKay. So anything having to do with IEU was not redacted, is that correct?

MS. FLEMING: Correct.
Q. And this indicates that IEU is clean but subject to the EES MESA. Would you believe that is the MSA that you were referring to earlier?
A. That was the acronym that $I$ used for the master services agreement, yes, and I don't remember if there's a word that stands for the $E$.
Q. But you actually used MESA?
A. I think I used MSA.
Q. Okay. And did you have a discussion with Mr. Blank with respect to this identified problem once you received this document?
A. This $I$ believe, and this is all out of context for me, but $I$ believe this document was actually created after $I$ had a discussion with someone at firstenergy. I don't recall
if that was with Mr. Blank or if that was with Mr. Headings. I have a feeling that it was with Mr. Headings who then summarized it in order to present it to Mr. Blank, but because it's taken out of context and don't know what came before it and what after it, I don't know that positively. Q. That's okay. We don't either.
(Discussion off record.)
Q. Mr. Headings, can you tell me what his role was with your review process?
A. Mr. Headings was primarily responsible for running the various reports that $I$ required in order to complete my reviews, which would be the valid claims listing and the error reports to deliver to suppliers and so forth and so on.

I alsomade inquiries of'
Mr. Headings from time to time on account number matches. If $I$ had an old customer account number from

Firstenergy's system that was provided to me by the supplier and as a result I couldn't identify that it was the correct account number for that particular location, $I$ would inquire of him and he could run an inquiry through the system to get me the match for the new customer account number that related to that same location.

From time to time Mr.
Blank asked me to sit and discuss my results with Mr. Headings who would then summarize them for Mr. Blank. Mr.

Headings was involved in various other discussions on the front end as it related to the types of reports that I would be using and the scope of the engagement and so forth and $I$ don't recall what else, what other involvement he may have had.
Q. Do you recall whether or not your concern with respect to the MSA was addressed with Mr. Headings rather than Mr. Blank?
A. I believe that my concerns
were discussed with both of them at various times.
Q. So you had several
conversations with respect to the MSA, is that correct?
A. I would have had several conversations based on when claims came up for my review.
Q. I'm not sure I followed that.
A. And I guess the answer to your question is yes, that there very well could have been and $I$ do specifically recallat least two conversations as it related to my initial review of IEU. There then would have been additional conversations as additional claims came up for review that were not included in the initial or the original round that $I$ would have then had additional conversations on.
Q. Specifically with respect to the MSA?
A. I would have to look at my notes positively, but f believe that
that's true, that each time that I would have discussed a claim with them, I probably would have brought it back up to their attention knowing that it was an unresolved item that $I$ had brought up to their attention previously, or at least unresolved from my knowledge.
Q. Before I mark these, if you could look at Bates numbers 71 through 76. Do these all go together or are these separate? It would appear there are two different - -
A. It appears as there were actually three different emails there.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniel2 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. $\quad 12$ is Bates number 71. This is an october $30 t h$ email from you to Mr. Blank, is that correct?
A. That is correct. indicate that as others become available such as internal auditing's documents and your lists of those companies that have requested reserves, along with your concerns, please forward them to me so we may be prepared at any time.
can you tell me what is

- what were you expecting from internal auditing's documentation?
A. My understanding was that the day that the web site went live, which was somewhere in the middle of October, $I$ don't know the specific date, that firstenergy had one or two representatives from their internal auditing department that actually were setting there in the room where the web site was being run from, whatever you want to describe it as, and were documenting the process that took place from the point in time that it went live and $I$ don't know how long that documentation continued for.
Q. Why did you want a copy of
that documentation?
A. , My understanding was that there were several difficulties that took place that day and $I$ don't know allof the difficulties, but my understanding is the web site went down for a period and so forth and not being present and not knowing exactly what happened, I thought that it might be helpful for us to get internal
auditing's documentation and gain an understanding of how they saw things progressing in order to determine what our involvement was going to be. This was on the very front end of our involvement prior to the time that an engagement letter or our procedures were even drafted.
Q. Did you get that
documentation from internal auditing?
A. I did not, I never received it.
Q. And why not?
A. It was never forwarded to me by Firstenergy and after we had been
through the discussions and gained a further understanding, I don't know that it would have been necessary for me to perform the procedures at Eirstenergy wanted me to perform.
(Thereupon, Deposition Exhibit-Diniell was marked for purposes of identification.)
Q. Dine Exhibit l3, Bates
number 72. This is an email from David Blank to you in which he indicates that he has some more information on timing ideas.

Could you give me a
little bit more detail in what he was discussing with respect to more information?
A. I do recall that this
message was in response to the previous email that we've marked now as Exhibit No. 12 , but $I$ don't recall specifically what that more information was.
Q. Okay. And timing ideas, do you recall what that referred to?
A. I don't know specifically. My question is that the timing of when they were hoping my reviews were going to take place.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniel4 was
marked for purposes
of identification.l
Q. Dinie Exhibit 14 and that would be Bates stamps 73 through 76 . At page 75 Bates page, is that your handwriting up at the top?
A. That is.
Q. I can almost read allofit, Dave's beginning of an audit - -
A. Work program.
Q. Thank you. Was this the beginning of what was going to be your scope of work?
A. I think this is what Dave originally had in mind until we gained
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a further understanding of what Firstenergy's system was actually able to do and how Firstenergy wanted to proceed in connection with my scope of work.
Q. So this was -- this document was revised as reflected in your engagement letter?
A. It's probably a question better asked to Dave. I think again this document is what he had in mind initially until we had further conversations on it and then it was determined that some or all of this may not work.
Q. Okay. Did you accept any affidavits from suppliers?
A. I did not.
Q. So in reviewing this, you would not - in reviewing pages 75 and 76 in particular, you would not say that this reflects the criteria for your engagement?
A. Absolutely not. The
criteria of my engagement are reflected
in the engagement letter and the
attachments to that letter that shows the agreed upon procedures．
（Thereupon，Deposition
Exhibit－Diniel5 was
marked for purposes
of identification．）

Q．Can we mark as Dinie Exhibit 15，this will be Bates stampsumber 14 through 70．Ms．Dinie，does this reflect the documents that were provided to you as a way of helping to explain the protocol？

A．I don＇t know that I would say these documents were all provided to me to help explain the protocol，but they were all provided to me to help explain the entire MSG program and I believe the protocol is actually one of these documents－－

Q．And did you review－－
A．－－with the exception of
Bates number 70 ．
Q. And what is the exception with number 70?
A. I don't know for sure why number 70 was provided to me. The only thing that $I$ can think of is that because $I$ had numerous contacts with suppliers, suppliers would sometimes ask questions of me that were probably more appropriately directed to Firstenergy, and if suppliers had difficulty finding the web site because the name had changed, that's maybe one of the questions that would have been coming my way. So I think firstenergy was anticipating that 1 could help field that if $I$ knew where the site had changed to, but that was provided well after the fact of my understanding of the MSG process.
Q. Okay. That's right, it's January. Did you review all these documents that are part of Dinie Exhibi't 15 ?
A. I read all these documents.

I don't know that $I$ would have reviewed
them in detail.
Q. Did you contact some of the authors of these documents to ask follow-up questions?
A. Any follow-up questions that I would have had would have went to Mr. Blank at that time.
Q. Do you recall follow-up questions that you had?
A. I believe $I$ did have a couple of questions.
Q. Do you recall what those are?
A. I don't recall what those are.
Q. Is there a reason that they provided information to you on the registration process?
A. I don't know of a specific reason other than for me to gain an understanding of the entire MSG program.
Q. Would that be the same answer with respect to scheduling information?
A. That would be correct.
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MS. FLEMING: Do you have an idea as to how much longer you're going to be?

MS. KAHN: Hopefully half an hour.

MS. ELEMING: I need to make just a quick call. I'll be back in just a minute.
(Recess had.)
(Thereupon, Deposition Exhibit-Diniel6 was
marked for purposes of identification.)
Q. It's marked as Dinie Exhibit 16, it will be Bates numbers 77 through 80.

Ms. Dinie, could you explain who Mr. Noel is?
A. Mr. Noel is an experienced manager in Andersen's business consulting practice.
Q. And why did you want him to review the scope of work?
A. Mr. Noel has been involved in the entire Firstenergy customer choice process and because MSG was in some way, shape or form a portion of customer choice and the entire Firstenergy settlement, we wanted to make sure that there weren't any concerns or thoughts that Mr. Noel might be able to provide to us in conjunction with the procedures that we were being asked to perform.
Q. Did he give you any input, he being Mr. Noel?
A. He had inquiries more than input to the best that $I$ can recall.
Q. Do you recall if you revised the procedures based on Mr. Noel's input?
A. I don't believe the procedures were revised based on his input, no.
Q. Could you turn to Bates stamp number 79 ? Number 4 appears to be different than what was actually executed. That would be Dinie Exhibit 1. Am $I$ correct that it is different than what was actually executed?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you recall why it was changed?
A. I don't recall positively why it was changed, although the copy that you're looking at was provided to Mr. Noel prior to -- I believe is prior to our final discussions with Firstenergy, so it's very possible that there could have been some revisions made in finalizing the document.
Q. For example, the quantity of generation claimed has been deleted in the final executed agreement. Do you know why?
A. I don't recall positively, no.
Q. Did Mr. Noel give any input' on section 3 with respect to your review of customer contracts?
A. I don't recall specifically
if he gave any input to that. I do know that he said that the types of things that we've listed here under whether or not there's any executory types of provisions were things that he had also heard that firstenergy was concerned with.
Q. Did he suggest additional examples?
A. Not that $I$ can recall.
Q. Dinie number 17, Bates stamped number 85. Strike that. We already discussed this.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniel 7 was
marked for purposes
of identification.l
Q. Now we're going to do Dinie Exhibit 17, which would be Bates number 122. There's a phrase on this exhibit stating that all of these are pending waiting for the choice of a supplier. I want to focus on that,
but first let me ask you, the claims pending say $T O L$. In your mind is that Toledo?
A. My understanding that's the supplier code for toledo.
Q. And that would be for the City of toledo?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And do you recall if this is nonresidential?
A. I'm pretty confident it's nonresidential because $I$ don't believe that even to date toledo has submitted any residential claims, but $I$ don't know that positively.
Q. okay. And do you know what the phrase all of these are pending waiting the choice of a supplier, what that means?
A. I do not know this. This was not a document prepared by me.
Q. Are you aware of whether Toledo was told they have to have a supplier in place to get MSG claims?
A. I don't know that.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Diniel 8 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Dinie Exhibit 18 is Bates stamped number 124. Ms. Dinie, this is an email from, I believe, Kevin Murray.

Would that be Kevin murray at the top as far as you're aware?
A. I believe that is Kevin Murray, but it doesn't appear to be from him.
Q. I'm sorry, it's to him from Mr. Vaccaro at firstenergy?
A. That appears to be correct.
Q. Do you know if there is a reason why you received this or what the reason was?
A. I have no idea why I was copied on this.
Q. Do you recall claim number 55 ?
A. Not specifically, I couldn't give you the details of what customers were under that claim or even what company that claim was made under.
Q. Do you recall claim number 2652 having to be revised?
A. Again, not specifically.
Q. Do you know what a partial power adjustment situation is?
A. I do not.
Q. Did this creation of claim 2652 issue result from your review of IEU?
A. No.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinielg was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Dinie Exhibit 19 is Bates stamped 125 through 128 . Ms. Dinie, once again you were carbon copied on this email from Mr. Vaccaro to Mr.

Blank. This email indicates that
pursuant to Mr. Kevin Murray's instructions, Mr. Vaccaro has
successfully removed the suggested customers from a previously approved IEU claim.

Was this ever discussed with you, the removal of customers?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. When customers were dropped from a claim, were you asked to go out and do an additional review?
A. Not on the claim that they were being dropped from. It could have provided additional capacity that then would have become available that $I$ probably would have been asked to review for whoever was next in line.
Q. okay. Were you asked to assist in a process for dropping customers from a claim, in developing a process?
A. No.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie20 was
marked for purposes of identification.)
Q. Dinie Exhibit 20, Bates stamp numbers 131 through 133 . Ms. Dinie, I'm correct that this is an email from you to Kevin Murray?
A. That's correct.
Q. You indicate in your email that his voice mail and fax concerning the second round claims being reviewed was exactly what you needed.

Do you remember what that voice mail and fax indicated?
A. I would have to have my notes in front of me to say for sure, but I'm sure it related to the additional claims that were up for review in the second round and being able to review the agreements and so forth for those claims.
Q. So are you indicating that he had faxed you the agreements?
A. That's correct.
Q. And do you recall if that
was the same agreement that you had reviewed in the first round for IEU customers with IEU?
A. It appeared to be the same template, if that's what you're referring to.
Q. Did it also have the MSA attached to it?
A. It did not.
Q. So there was no requirement in the second round of contracts for execution of the MSA, is that correct?
A. I inquired as to whether or not the status of the MSA had changed, meaning had it actually been executed, and the response was no and as a result there was no reason for me to have to review another copy or to have another copy sent to me.
Q. But the contract that was sent to you did still make reference to the MSA, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And it still required execution of the MSA?

A. That's correct.
Q. And why November $18 t h$ ?
A. My understanding was that for some reason there was a glitch in the firstenergy systems that claims that were submitted prior to November $18 t h$, there was a chance that not every single account number that would have been uploaded for that claim was picked up by the firstenergy system and that that glitch was fixed on November 18 th.
And so Firstenergy
requested that $I$ get the ASCII files for all claims submitted prior to November $18 t h$ so they could then do a comparison of the ASCII files that the supplier said they were submitting into the web site as to what the firstenergy system actually picked up and to make sure if there were any discrepancies that they got them corrected.
Q. The ASCII file for
clarification was what was actually submitted when a claim was made, is
that correct?
A. That's my understanding. It was the actual data information that was uploaded into the web site by the suppliers.
Q. The documents attached to your cover email at 135 through 140 , would this reflect the list that you were talking about earlier as to how you identified what claims in the scope of your review?
A. First off, the documents attached to the email Bates number 134 are not these documents, or at least should not be these documents. I don't know where the document is that's actually attached to or should be attached to 134, although I know I saw a copy of it in here elsewhere.
Q. It's the second round letter that we were talking about earlier, I believe?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right.
A. But the answer to your
question is the documents that are Bates
numbers 135 through 140 are not the list that $I$ was referring to, no.
Q. What are these?
A. This is a list that $I$ prepared and sent to firstenergy as a request for them to run the lists that I was working off of and that i needed to give to the suppliers for the claim numbers that were up in line for the second and the third rounds of reviews.
Q. And how did you prepare this list?
A. It was based on reviewing the most recent queue that $I$ had in my hand, which was the document that we've marked as Exhibit - Dinie Exhibit 3, to see what the next claims were in line.
Q. Eirst in, first out, is that Dinie Exhibit 3 ?
A. Yes, that's correct.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie22 was
marked for purposes of identification.)
Q. Let's mark as Dinie 22 Bates stamps 142 through 144. Do you know if the information request that is referenced at the top of page 142 is the information requested at page 144 ?
A. It is.
Q. Page 144 , it indicates that there are some issues with contract dates. Do you recall how that was resolved?
A. As I recall, I was provided information that would have supported the fact that the contract information was in place prior to the date of the claim.
Q. And what type of information would you be looking for in that regard?
'A. I don't recall what was specifically provided to me in these cases.
Q. If you could pull out Bates
stamps number 147 through 153 . Before I mark it, when you get it back if you could just tell me if these all go together.
A. I don't believe these go
together. I believe the first two pages do, but the attachments on the second page are attachments that $I$ can never open. They give me a fatal error on my computer.
Q. okay. Can you explain to me - we don't really need to mark this - why claims would need to be revalidated?
A. I don't know positively why claims would need to be revalidated other than if claims were submitted that had an error, if it was an invalid account number or an ineligible customer status that kicked out from the Firstenergy system when the supplier went in to correct that, if they made the corrections, my understanding was that the web site would not
automatically make those corrections in Firstenergy's system, that it had to go
through a validation process before Firstenergy's system would be able to produce properties that would actually show those corrections. My understanding is that validation process at some point in time started to take place on a nightly basis.
Q. Do you know why all of IEU's claims would have to be revalidated?
A. I don't recall positively why all of IEU's claims would have to be revalidated.
Q. And I think I do want to mark 147 and 148 as Dinie Exhibit 23.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie 23 was
marked for purposes
of identification.
Q. It says down in the second paragraph this is an email that you got' from Mr. Vaccaro, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. That due to the inherent
nature of the application, the supplier would not be able to modify any
cancelled contract. Do you know what that means?
A. Based on my reading of the context provided here, it appears as if it means that after the five-day correction period expired for individual suppliers to go in and correct errors, whether it be invalid accounts or inactive customer statuses, that those account numbers if they were not corrected after that five-day period would be cancelled, and due to the inherent nature of the application, the supplier would not be able to go in and modify any cancelled accounts, just the ones that were new errors that happened after that cancellation process took place.
Q. So would your view be that the inability to modify cancelled contracts would be good?
A. If $m y$ understanding of that is correct, yes, because once it's
cancelled, it means that the five-day period has expired and the supplier failed to correct it appropriately so you wouldn't want them to be able to go back in and to touch it again.
Q. And is there a reason why there's a discussion of the IEU revalidated claims at the same time there is a discussion of the cancelled contracts?
A. That I don't know.

MS. KAHN: Okay. If you redacted, it was because it was not IEU, is that correct?

MS. FLEMING: Or Toledo.
THE WItNeSS: Or it was
customer names or accounts.
MS. FLEMING: Right.
MS. KAHN: For IEU
possibly?
THE WITNESS: Or Toledo.
Q. When you were doing your review, did you collect copies of the contracts that you relied upon for the committed capacity sale?
A. I did not do that for my initial round of reviews.
Q. And did you for later reviews?
A. Only as needed in order to facilitate the process because the hopes was that $I$ would not have to make trips to all of the suppliers again and that the review would be done by way of email, fax, mail, overnight delivery, whatever was easiest.
Q. And what would you do with those contracts once you had reviewed them?
A. For the most part, most of those contracts $I$ still have with the intention of destroying them upon the completion of this engagement.
Q. And if a claimant asked you to destroy them, would you do that as soon as you had reviewed them or did you hold them for a while?
A. I did not do it as soon as I reviewed them for fear that questions would come back or that $I$ would need to
refer back to them. Upon completion of the engagement is usually when we purge our files.
Q. Can we marked Bates stamps 164 to 165 as number 24 .
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie24 was
marked for purposes
of identification.l
Q. Okay. I'll direct your attention to the first paragraph, sorry for the delay in responding, this is from Mr. Murray to you. Do yourecall which contract was being provided?
A. For which customer? No, I don't.
Q. Do you recall whether or not you've destroyed that contract?
A. I don't believe I have. I believe $I$ still have copies.
Q. And would this be the contract that was sort of the standard IEU member contract with the MSA
attached?
A. This would be the contract that is the standard IEU contract between itself and its customer, but the MSA would not have been attached because I didn't request it a second time.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-25 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Bates stamp 184 . Ms. Dinie could you explain the handwritten notes at the bottom of the page with respect to Toledo? Specifically you have the comment, Is there even a contract.
A. As I recall, thefirst two items there, do by phone and fax and is there even a contract, were based on a discussion that between Mr. Blank and myself had regarding the claim that the City of Toledo had in at that point in time, or claims, which was - which were actually for the City of Toledo's
city loads and the question was being as that they're claiming on behalf of themselves is there even going to be any type of a contract there.
Q. And was there any discussion with respect to the need for a supplier?
A. There was not any discussion with respect to the need for a supplier.
Q. Do you know if they had a supplier?
A. I don't know if they had a supplier.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie26 was
marked for purposes
of identification.l
Q. Bates stamp 187, number 26. These appear to be to handwritten notes'. Are these your notes?
A. They are.
Q. And you're discussing
contract contingencies, Firstenergy Services involvement. Was that specifically with respect to IEU?
A. Those two items were specifically with respect to IEU, yes.
Q. And what were those notes reflecting?
reflecting?
A. These were notes to myself of items that $I$ needed to bring to Mr. Blank's attention the morning following my visit to IEU.
Q. So do you remember the date of this?
A. Without knowing the date that $I$ visited IEU, no.
Q. Okay. And availability of contract provisions, re: legal binding document, a letter was sent, what does that note mean?
A. That note actually refers to a different supplier and that's why there's a redaction off to the left as does the one below it.
Q. Bates 191. Never mind, changed mymind. okay. 193 through

$$
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$$

194, this is number 27.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie27 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Ms. Dinie, this is dated November 1 st and it says D. Blank below that. Was that an indication this was a phone conversation or some conversation with Mr. Blank?
A. Some conversation with him, yes.
Q. Do you remember whether it was in person?
A. I don't recall positively.
Q. Okay. And these are your notes from that conversation?
A. That's correct.
Q. About halfway down it says Industrial Energy Users-Columbus. Do . you know what the conversation was with respect to Industrial Energy Users?
A. If recall correctly, Dave
was giving to me the suppliers that he was aware of that had claims out there that would be included in the initial round that we were looking at and he was giving me the locations of where those reviews would probably have to take place so could get an idea of what kind of travel was going to be involved to set my schedule.
Q. There seems to be a one and a circle. Do you know what that is?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. On the next page it says, Expect this will result in a legal process. Do you remember what the conversation was with respect to that note?
A. I don't recall positively. -
\{Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie28 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Bates number 201, this is
28. Are these your handwritten notes? A. They are.
Q. Do you recall when you made them?
A. I don't recall the specific date.
Q. Do you recall if this was a result of your visit to IEU?
A. Based on the notes that are here, $I$ would say that it was after my visit with IEU.
Q. You indicate that you need to check on the credit arrangements between IEU and firstenergy Services, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And can you explain to me what you were trying to check?
A. I don't recall positively.
Q. Do you recall what it was that you reviewed that made you write that note?
A. I think it was a result of the discussions that $I$ had with Firstenergy after my entire initial
round was completed when m said there was kind of one day where we discussed everything that was in the initial round.
Q. And this credit arrangement came up in that discussion?
A. I believe that's the case.
Q. And here you indicate it's a credit arrangement between IEU and Firstenergy Services. Is there a reason why you believe that's who the credit arrangement was between?
A. I don't recall positively.
Q. The next line says, And customer in accordance with MSA. Who are you referring to with respect to the customer there?
A. I think that whole line goes together because I think that's all under the first dash.
Q. Okay.
A. I should say the first two lines go together.
Q. So you needed to check the customer in accordance with the MSA, or
is it credit arrangements between IEU/EirstEnergy Services and the customer?
A. I think that's the way it's meant to be.
Q. And who do you refer to as customer there?
A. I don't recall. We talked about this at the beginning and $I$ don't recall what the customer is without going back through the agreements.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie29 was
marked for purposes
of identification.
Q. Bates stamps 203 through 233, this is number 29. Ms. Dinie, is that your handwriting on the left of Bates 203?
A. It is.
Q. And $I$ believe that says on 12 - is that 21?
A. Correct.
Q. or 26?
A. I think it's 21.
Q. You indicated that it was subject to firstenergy Services MSA which has not been finalized, and was that with respect to all the IEU claims?
A. All the IEU claims that $I$ had looked at as of that point in time.
Q. And you also say some not subject to initial process. Does that indicate that some of the IEU claims were in the second round on this list?
A. That would indicate that there were specific customer account numbers within these IEU claims, this is all one claim as you'll seefor the first three pages is all the same claim number, but there were certain account numbers that because of the way the scopes were set and the selection process was made, that those account numbers would not have been subject to my testing, if you will.
Q. So this is where you got
into the you would only do 33 percent?
A. That's correct.
Q. This is the list that you would have been looking at to make that determination?
A. No, that's not correct.
Q. We're going to get that list.
A. It's in there.
Q. It's probably one I didn't check. So if you indicate on a page that it's subject to the FES MSA, for instance page 213, you're saying for all the claims in number 61, is that correct?
A. I'm saying for all of the accounts in claim number 61 that they would be subject to that, yes, or at least all of the claims that were subject to my process. To the extent that one of them wasn't subject to my process, I obviously wouldn't have looked at that.
Q. When you say not subject to your process, that goes to the issue of
the scope of what you reviewed again? A. That's correct.
(Thereupon, Deposition Exhibit-Dinie30 was marked for purposes of identification.)
Q. Dinie Exhibit 30 and it is Bates 311. Ms. Dinie, this does not indicate who the email was from. Do you have any idea?
A. I believe that that information has actually been redacted because it's from one of IEU's customers and it had customer identifying information in it.
MS. FLEMING: And I Can
confirm that that was the case.
Q. Do you know what this firstenergy IEU pool load data logo stands for by any chance?
A. I believe that was the name of the attached file.
Q. Do you know why you had this
in your files?
A. In performing my review at IEU, the contracts between reu and its customer or customers referred to attachments that indicated what service locations were to be covered under that contract and these were the documents that $I$ was presented with as the attachments in order to identify which service locations were to be covered.
Q. The 5410, it's in the third line, see attachment with the update on 5410 .
A. $\quad \mathrm{Um}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Do you know what the 5410 refers to?
A. I don't know what it refers to.
Q. Is it a claim number?
A. I doubt that, but I don't know that positively.
Q. And why do you doubt that?
A. Just based on the date of this particular document, I don't think that there were claim numbers that high.
Q. And once again this was provided to you with the attachment?
A. I believe so. And they don't appear to be in order, but $I$ believe so.
Q. And the purpose of it being provided to you was to confirm the locationsfor a particular claim?
A. To confirm the locations for a particular customer.
Q. So this was a document that was part of the review materials when you visited IEU or provided to you later?
A. I don't recall specifically, but based on the date of this, this was probably part of the review materials on my initial review that $\quad$ collected at the end of the day because they were trying to get me out of there before rush hour hit, I'malmost embarrassed to say.

> Q. It's a good thing in

Columbus. Okay. Let me alsomark 312 as -- why don't we mark 311 and 312
both as number 30. I think that would be easier, $I$ think they're similar.
can you explain why you
have this particular email?
A. It's the same as the one that we just discussed.
Q. And so the purpose was to help explain the locations for a particular customer?
A. The purpose was for me to be able to identify what locations the particular customer wanted covered under the contract that it had or the agreement that it had with IEU.
Q. Let's go to Bates number 302 through 307 . This is 31.
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie31 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Why don't you take a moment to look through all of these if you would because 1 have some general
questions.
Ms. Dinie, would these reflect your notes on the master services agreement?
A. Some of these would reflect notes on the master services agreement.
Q. And are these notes with respect to your review of IEU's claim in the initial round?
A. I believe they're all related to the initial round, yes.
Q. And this was your actual visit to IEU?
A. That's correct.
Q. okay. At page 302 you have a note, number one, what other agreements are anticipated between the member and IEU. Could you explain what that means?
A. If I recall correctly, as I was going through the agreement between IEU and its member, there was a provision in there that said other agreements may have to be executed and I inquired.as to what types of other
agreements they were expecting to be executed.
Q. And this was the form agreement that we've discussed earlier had a reference to other agreements that would have to be executed?
A. Other agreements that may have to be executed, that's correct. This is the form template.
Q. And what other agreements were designated?
A. Upon inquiry of the individuals representing IEU and $I$ don't remember who $I$ specifically spoke to, it was either Mr. Randazzo or Mr. Murray, they indicated that they were not intending any specific agreements to be executed other than the master services agreement and that this was just kind of a catch-all in case they had missed something.
Q. Okay. And number two you indicate that not all members claimed and $I$ think that's a question mark.
A. Correct.
Q. And then you have not true, disconnect, could you explain that?
A. In reviewing the contracts that IEU had presented to me, I was unable to find in the listings that Firstenergy had provided to me names or at least $I$ thought $I$ was unable to find names related to those customers that were in that contract in some instances. And $I$ was curious as to IEU had made a decision not to make claims on behalf of certain customers and that's what my question was and it was explained to me no, that's not true, and that's how the glitch in the Firstenergy system was discovered, because when $I$ reported that back to Eirstenergy and said, hey, I've seen contracts out here that they're saying they've claimed and I'm not seeing those on my listings, that's when it was discovered that there was the glitch in the system and I needed to get the ASCII files so that Firstenergy could
run that check to make sure they picked up everything that had been claimed.
Q. And this was the November 18 th issue that we discussed earlier, that while you were asking --
A. November $18 \mathrm{th}, \mathrm{that}$ 's correct, yes.
Q. So as a result of this inquiry, it is your testimony that IEU was claiming for allofits members, is that correct?
A. I wouldn't say allof its members because $I$ don't know if its membership is more extensive than the contracts that looked at, but it was claiming for all of the customers for which I reviewed contracts.
Q. okay. And once again you said that was about 20 , is that correct?
A. About 20 contracts, 20 customers, yes.
Q. And number four, $I$ can't quite read what that note is.
A. Time period indicated by
some members.
Q. Could you explain what you meant by that?
A. On some of the attachments that identified the service locations that the members wanted covered under the agreement, they had indicated a time period on there and $I$ was trying to decipher what that meant and that was my inquiry.
Q. And what did it mean?
A. In my discussions again with either Mr. Randazzo and/or Mr. Murray, they indicated to me that that was actually the period for which that particular customer had listed its historic capacity or historic load for that particular account.

MS. KAHN: Could you read that back again.
(Record read.)
Q. On Bates 303 you indicate what other agreements must be executed. Is this the same reference as you had on 302?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. And not all customers listed on attachments claimed, is that what we've already discussed?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have once again the time periods and a question mark. Is this the time periods that we were just discussing?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have time period for ohio, GGCElectric, and I'm not sure about the rest of it. Can you explain what you've written there and what it means?
A. I believe that there was a time period indicated under like that particular column or that particular row that referenced ohio GGC Electric. I don't know what that last word is, term or team maybe, but $I$ don't know for sure what it means. It was just a reference for me to be able to identify where that was at so that $I$ could show it to them and ask them what this time period meant.
Q. For a particular claim --
A. For --
Q. -- or customer?.
A. For a particular customer or maybe more than one customer, I don't recall specifically.
Q. And you have that contracts were not found but claimed. Can you explain that?
A. There were a couple of contracts or there were a couple of accounts that $I$ saw on the iisting that Firstenergy had provided to me that $I$ could not identify a contract for upon my initial review.
Q. And how was that resolved?
A. I had inquired about that and the contracts were provided to me. I think one was provided actually that day that they had just mistakenly left it out and $I$ think another one was sent to me.
Q. And Bates stamp 304, do you recall who the parties were to the
master service agreementor is it in your notes anywhere?
A. I believe the master services agreement based on my notes was between $f E S$ and $I E U$. I don't recall if there were any other parties.
Q. And do you recall what
services $f$ es is offering or providing under the master services agreement?
A. I don't recall positively.
Q. Can you look through your notes and see if that can be determined?
A. I can't determine based on my notes what services would be provided.
Q. Do you know, do you recall if it was power procurement?
A. I don't remember positively.
Q. Scheduling or supplying?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. But you do recall
that firstenergy Services was going to be the supplier of those services?
A. I don't recall that, either.

I don't know what services they were.
Q. Okay. You have in your
notes that - a reference to assured pricing pooled energy. Do you recall what the assured pricing pooled energy is?
A. I don't recall offhand what that is or how it was defined.
Q. And your notes don't reflect other than saying it's definition number four, 2000 megawatts. Do you know what that means?
A. I would guess that definition number four is where assured pricing pooled energy was either found or was defined and $I$ don't recall specifically what the 200 megawatts relates to.
Q. It says IEU must receive the assured pricing pooled energy. Do you know what that means in your notes?
A. Again, $I$ don't remember positively. I think, if $I$ recall correctly, that iev, exactly as stated here, had to receive this assured
pricing pooled energy and $I$ don't know for sure what that relates to though or why they had to receive that.
Q. And do you know who they were receiving it from?
A. I don't know what the assured pricing pooled energy is, so no, I don't know who it was being received from.
Q. Do you know how the assured pricing pooled energy is related to the MSG?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Do you know or recall who was handling the billing --
A. I don't recall.
Q. -- under the MSA?
A. I don't recall that, either.
Q. okay. It appears that you indicated a ten-year term in your notes. Do you know what that commitment was for ten years?
A. I believe that was the duration of the MSA.
Q. And what was to occur --
what was the commitment for those ten years?

MS. FLEMING: Objection,
asked and answered.
Q. You can still answer.
A. I don't know what services were provided under the MSA.
Q. Okay. You have a note here with respect to if Firstenergy Services can source at a lower price for a calendar year, then $F E S$ and IEU will take efforts to maximize resale revenue of MSG.

Do you know, do you recall what that was about?
A. I believe that that was a provision from the contract. Whether it's a direct quote or whether it was revised into my notes, $I$ don't know.
Q. Do you recall if they were going to be reselling the msG that IEU was obtaining?
A. Other than what's written here, I don't recall any additional pieces of information that would have
surrounded that.
Q. Do you recall anything with respect to how EES is going to source at a lower price?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Was there anything with respect to who would be delivering the source at a lower price?
A. I don't know.
Q. A couple lines down you have price set and then will negotiate, the price is set from 1/1/01 to $12 / 31 / 05$. Do you know what price that is that's being set?
A. It's a price for industrial and commercial customers. That's what the I\&C stands for.
Q. A price for generation?
A. I don't recall.
Q. And it's going to be a negotiated market price from 06 through ten. Do you recall what that price is. being set for?
A. It relates to the same price as above because it's a subbullet, but

I don't recall what it was for.
Q. You have a note that IEU is eligible for five to 20 percent of savings to a customer. Can you explain that?
A. I don't recall the specifics.
Q. Do you recall who the customer is there?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. What is the sSA? I
believe it's at the top of 304 .
A. That's the service and supply agreement.
Q. And what was that?
A. Those would be the agreements between $I E U$ and its customers and members.
Q. Okay. So it was referred to as the services and supply agreement and that's what the MSA was attached to, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And as far as you know, the MSA has not been executed yet?
A. To the best of my knowledge, but $I$ haven't made that inquiry anytime recently.
Q. okay. In reviewing this MSA, could you get a sense of what the role of Firstenergy Services would be?
A. I might have at that time, but I don't recall now.
Q. Okay. You have down here a note on limitation of liability clause and then $I$ think it's FAS 133 , is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. What does that mean?
A. There must have been some sort of limitation of liability clause in the MSA that limited the liability of FES and that was kind of a note to myself to see if that create any FAS 133 issues for Firstenergy.
Q. Could you complain EAS 133?'
A. Einancial Accounting

Standards Board 133 , which relates to derivative and hedging activities. into that?
A. In conjunction with my work on the Firstenergy audit.
Q. And what was your conclusion?
A. I don't recall specifically.
Q. So this is for your audit versus this review procedure?
A. Yes, it's for a separate engagement.
Q. And that's why you wrote that note because you were concerned with respect to your other engagement?
A. I wanted to make sure that I understood -- being that this was a contract that firstenergy Services had out there, $I$ wanted to make sure that $I$ had understood what that limitation of liability was in conjunction with fAS 133.
Q. Did you discuss that with anyone?
A. I don't believe I did. I don't recall positively. No, I think I
had asked a question of one of the individuals at Firstenergy that was responsible for the FAS 133 implementation, or maybe responsible isn't a good word, but was kind of spearheading the 133 implementation and I think $I$ inquired as to whether it looked at Firstenergy Services and the contracts that it had.
Q. And who was that?
A. There's a couple of point persons and I don'trecall specifically who it was.
Q. And do you recall what their answer was as to whether or not they had reviewed that Firstenergy Services contracts?
A. I do know that they had looked at the FirstEnergy Services contracts.
Q. And who are the couple point persons?
A. Oh, there's an individual by the name of John Sommers or sommer. There's an individual by the name of

Elke, I think it's Becker. There was an individual by the name of Jeff Kalata.
Q. Are you indicating that whoever it was you spoke to responded by stating they had reviewed the MSA?
A. I don't know that I
specifically asked about the MSA. I think $I$ asked in general, because Firstenergy Services does have other contracts out there, as to whether or not appropriate individuals were involved over at Firstenergy Services and if the contracts over at firstenergy Services had been reviewed.
Q. Were there any other agreements between Firstenergy Services and IEU members when you were out doing your review that you recall?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Page 305 , about two-thirds of the way down, capacity needs, you indicate load following. Is that an indication that the IEU claim and then you have option claim -- strike. needs, load following and option claim, could you explain that to me?
A. If I recall correctly, I believe that it specified in the SSA agreements that claims would be made on a load following basis.
Q. And what is the option claim reference?
A. That they chose the load following option versus the capacity factor.
Q. Below that you have in quotes, Member understands that the exact structure of the IEU-OH aggregation program will be controlled by definitive agreements that shall be executed by firstenergy Services, IEU and member."

Was that part of the SSA?
A. I believe it was.
Q. And do you know what agreements were going to be executed by Firstenergy Services?
A. If I recall correctly, the
only one that was brought to my attention by Mr. Randazzo and Mr. Murray was the fact that the MSA had not been actually executed.
Q. So the MSA was going to control the aggregation program, is that correct?
A. That appears to be correct based on this statement.
Q. And it's going to be executed by the members as well as Firstenergy Services and IEU, is that correct from what you're stating?
A. That also appears to be correct based on this statement.
Q. Did you question anybody about that?
A. Question regarding what?
Q. Who would be executing it.
A. Who would be executing --
Q. The definitive agreement.
A. I don't know that the definitive agreement was a defined term. I think it's just definitive agreements and I don't know that I specifically
A. Ihat also appears tobe
asked who would be executing the definitive agreements.
Q. But l believe you just testified when you asked about the definitive agreements you were told was the MSA, is that correct?
A. Only as it relates to the document that was to be executed between Firstenergy services and IEU. This I believe -- if $I$ recall correctly, this was actually the quote that drove my first question that we talked about back on Bates number 302 , which says what other agreements are anticipated.

And when $I$ inquired of that, I was told that aside from the MSA, that there weren't any specific that they had in mind, but that that was kind of a catch-all for others that needed to be or potentially could need to be executed in the future.
Q. You have a question right below that, Can IEU allocate the assured pricing pooled energy among customers.

Did you get that question answered?
A. Yes, I believe I did.
Q. And what was the answer?
A. I believe that answer
actually came from Firstenergy. I think I inquired of firstenergy of that answer and the answer was yes, essentially they can allocate.
Q. What do you mean by allocate?
A. Amongst different customers. The context -- if I recall correctly the context of this question is that if there's not -- within the ssa agreement I think that was a provision that said if there's not enough MSG to suffice the entire IEU claim or claims which contained numerous customer accounts from various customers, then IEU could allocate the amounts, the assured pricing pooled energy amongst those customers.
Q. So what are you saying the assured pricing pooled energy is?
A. I would believe it's the MSG, but $I$ don't know that positively
because I don't recall the definition of it.

MS. FLEMING: I should
tell you at this point that $I$ have got to leave in 15 minutes.

MS. KAhN: Okay.
Q. So on your notes at 304 where it says IEU must receive assured pricing pooled energy, 200 megawatts, that would be once again MSG?
A. I don't know that positively. That would be my belief, but I don't know that positively.
Q. When you said that you checked with Firstenergy on allocation, who did you check with?
A. I don't recall that for sure, either. I think $I$ probably would have discussed that with Dave Blank.
Q. So you're referring to Firstenergy corp. or firstenergy Services?
A. Firstenergy corp.
Q. On page 306 you indicate
about midway down, the MSA, I think
that may be between IEU-Ohio and Firstenergy is entered into in substantially the same formas the draft document contained in appendix $A$.
A. That's correct.
Q. You say is entered into. Is that your understanding-- what was explained to you?
A. No, I believe this is a direct quote or as direct as I could possibly write it straight out of the SSA agreement.
Q. This is the language with respect to that the MSA has to be entered into in substantially the same form as thedraft?
A. That's correct.
Q. And at the very bottom you have, No prices here but in MSA for pooled customers. Can you explain that?
A. If I recallcorrectly, there
were no prices stated in the SSA
agreements, but there were pricings in the MSA for whatever pooled customers is.
(Recess had.)
MS. KAHN: I'm not sure
that we're going to be able to
conclude, so would like to leave it open and then leave open the possibility of concluding later if we need to.

What we'll do is I have a few more questions to ask that $I$ hope will maybe get us to point where we won't actually have to come back, but I do need to look at these documents more thoroughly and make sure we've covered the issues that were in here previously. I think we have but $I$ would like to compare it to the transcript and make sure and get back to you and let you know.

MS. FLEMING: We wouldn't
want to come back again since we've already been here over five hours. If that can be curtailed or perhaps even we can agree that these are her notes or you know, whatever, we would be happy to do that in writing.

MS. KAHN: We might be
able to do that. We might be able to do some of it with interrogatories. we'll try to figure out something, but I do have a few more questions. BY MS. KAHN:
Q. Ms. Dinie, in a letter that I received from your counsel it is indicated that you had copies of IEU's member contingent participation agreement and that you were not going to produce that document. Is the member contingent participation agreement related to the MSA?
A. $\quad \mathrm{N} \circ$.
Q. Is it the SSA?
A. It is.
Q. It is the SSA? Okay. And that is the criteria that you looked at to make the determination - not to make the determination; to advise Firstenergy whether there were issues with respect to a committed capacity sale, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And this is the template
document that we've been discussing a fair amount for the last several hours?
A. Between IEU and its member customers, correct.
Q. Did you discuss the SSA with Mr. Blank?
A. I would have discussed my concerns with the SSA with Mr. Blank.
Q. Did you provide Mr. Blank a copy of it?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. Did you provide Mr. Blank a copy of the MSA?
A. I never had a copy of the MSA. I reviewed a copy of the MSA, but I've never had a copy of the mSA in my possession.

MS. KAHN: Thank you. I believe we can at least not close the deposition, but put it on - -

MS. FLEMING: I can go another couple minutes if you have a couple more questions.

MR. HARDYMON: Mr. Ruxin
is being left out of this discussion.

Is that okay with you, paul?
MR. RUXIN: Yes, it is.
I encourage it.
BY MS. KAHN:
Q. Let me do one more item, Dinie Exhibit 32,377 and believe it goes to 385 .
(Thereupon, Deposition
Exhibit-Dinie32 was
marked for purposes
of identification.)
Q. Do you have that document in front of you? Am $I$ correct this is all one document?
A. That's not correct.
Q. Am $\quad$ correct that one document consists of 377 through 379 ?
A. That's correct.
Q. okay. Why don't we do that, first. Can you identify this document, please?
A. This is my written summary of my review related to Industrial

Energy Users.
Q. And did you provide this written summary to Mr. Blank?
A. I provided it to him to read and review with me as we went paragraph by paragraph with the items that $I$ had noted, but then he returned it at the end of that conversation that day.
Q. And on the left side you have some handwritten notes. Those are the two items that you've discussed earlier with respect to the follow-up?
A. That would be correct.
Q. And it's your understanding that MSG is flowing to the IEU members?
A. It's my understanding that MSG was claimed on behalf of the IEU members so they would ultimately be the recipients, yes.
Q. Do you know if they're actually receiving MSG yet?
A. I don't know that positively.
Q. Okay. At page 378 you have a note that you are unable to determine
that the customers had agreed to the locations to be covered because the customers did not sign the attachments. How was that resolved?
A. The very last sentence there however, in all instances $I$ was able to verify at least one piece of customer information.
Q. Were you able to verify that they had designated their locations prior to October 19th?
A. I believe that would be the case, if I recall correctly. I would have to go back to my notes to be sure, but if I recall correctly, the information that $I$ was provided didn't concern me from a date issue.
Q. And you have in the next paragraph that Mr. Murray provided you copies with emails and faxes from two of the customers. Was that because there were only two customers with which you had concerns?
A. I don't recall positively.

I would have to go back.to my notes.
Q. And you indicate in your summary that the customer sent information via fax and email regarding their accounts. Did you have proof of that?
A. I think $I$ now understand. The attachments to the contracts in some times were spreadsheets that gave me no indication as to who had prepared them or how the information was obtained and so forth, and upon inquiry of that, Mr. Murray indicated to me that in some cases IEU had actually prepared that information from information that the . customers had sent to them piecemeal through emails, faxes and soforth.

I asked to see a couple of those emails and faxes in order to make sure and to verify that what he was telling me was truly the situation and $I$ believe that's the couple of emails and faxes that he had provided.
Q. And you felt that reviewing two of those was a sufficient review --
A. In finding --
Q. - or a sufficient sample?
A. In finding no discrepancies,

I thought that was at least enough to support his statement, yes.
Q. And also at 378 at the bottom it references la contracts that you reviewed and $\quad$ believe I've seen elsewhere today that there were 18 contracts that you reviewed 1 think in your handwritten notes. Is there a reason for a discrepancy here?
A. As you also probably recall that you had seen earlier today, because of the scope that was set for my procedures, it wasn't necessary that I review every single contract that was out there. It depended upon which specific accounts were selected in conjunction with the scope that was laid out, so although there might have been 18 contracts in total, the scopeof my procedures might have only required me to look at 14 .
Q. So while 18 contracts were presented, is what you're saying you
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[^4]:    Above documentation available by visiting www.firstenergycorp.com and linking
    to Supplier Services in the left hand navigation.

[^5]:    Further information regarding EDI testing can be found in the Techinical Support Emailing
    .
    $\qquad$ or by

[^6]:    

[^7]:    Prior to October 19, Suppliers are encouraged to contact the
    FirstEnergy Supplier Services Center to obtain password information, as well as import file testing, and resolution of any problems you may encounter with the web application.

[^8]:    Technical overview
    Q/A

[^9]:    - Is pool capacity still available ?

    OATT / service agreement

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Under Section 5 of Supplemental Settlement Materials, FE absorbs the service area line losses associated with 1,120 MW of non-Market Support Generation identified in that section. This nonMSG is not a second block of $1,120 \mathrm{MW}$ of capacity. Usage of the term "non-MSG" in this protocol does not modify FE's obligations defined by the Supplemental Settlement Materials.

[^11]:    2 "Residential " customers Include the following: for Ohio Edison, those customers served on Rates 10, 11, 17 and 19; for The lluminating Company, those customers served on the Residential, ResIdential Water Heating, Residential Water and Space Heating, and Residential Space Heating; for Toledo Edison, those customers served on Rates R-01, R-01a, R-02, R-06 and R-06a. "Other Retail " customers include customers served on all other shoppable rate schedules.

[^12]:    ${ }^{3}$ Each claim shall be a separate file. Due to data processing limitations, no claim shall include more than 10,000 customers. If the supplier is requesting generation for more than 10,000 customers, then multiple claims can be made, each of which shall not exceed the maximum number of 10,000 .

    - A claimant for a Residential category may, at its option, use the requirements of this section rather than the requirements of Section 5.e.

[^13]:    ${ }^{5}$ The historic peak load is defined as the highest measured peak incurred in the most recent available 12 billing months for customers with demand meters, and as the calculated peak load for customers without demand meters, with the calculated peak load based on the customer's energy consumption in the most recent available 12 billing months. For those residential and small commercial customers with new load, or not having 12 months of usage ended, a
    __calculated method shall be used to determine the peak load. F.or all other customers, the peak load shall be quantified and approved by the company.

    Only one supplier 's claim for part or all of the customer's load will be accepted, and the supplier may not make more than one claim for MSG and one claim for non-MSG per customer. Per the Supplemental Settlement Materials, the entire customer's load must be served by the Market Support Generation il Load Following option is elected.
    ${ }^{6}$ The "Load Following" and "Capacity Factor" options are defined in section 2 of the Supplemental Settlement Materials referred to above. For suppliers selecting the capacity factor option, scheduling details will be identified in subsequent supplier/utiity communications. For purposes of claiming market support generation capacity, the peak load in the twelve months ended June 2000 as identified in footnote 3, shall be used.

[^14]:    ${ }^{7}$ If an intended supplier has not achieved CRES certification when it has made a claim for market support generation, the supplier's place in the first-come-first-served queue shall be forfeited (a) thirty calendar days following submittal of the claim or (b) thirty calendar days following the date when the PUCO first accepts CRES applications, whichever occurs later. Forfeiture Waivers-may be granted by the company on a case-by-case basis for good cause shown (reasons beyond the control of the claimant) and shall be granted for each day that the PUCO extends its certification review period. Delivery of MSG capacity and non-MSG line losses to an Eligible Supplier shall not commence prior to its certification by the Commission.

[^15]:    ${ }^{8}$ Such alternative to be consistent with the verification required by the PUCO for CRES certification
    ${ }^{9}$ The utility shall verity the contract term by reviewing that provision in the Generation Service Agreement or alternate verification form, or through appropriate auditing techniques
    ${ }^{10}$ This tariff and its subsequent service agreement mandate all requirements for scheduling, delivery, and billing.
    "If the Company affiliates are required to relinquish any generation per the terms of the Supplemental Stipulation, the affiliates shall relinquish such capacity on the next customer meter reading date following notification of the need to relinqulsh, as long as such date is at least 12 days following the notice. If less than 12 days remain until the next meter reading date following notification, the following month's meter read date shall be the date of relinquishment.

[^16]:    $\overline{12}$ A business day is defined as a day when the general office of FirstEnergy is open for business.

[^17]:    02000 Arthur Andersen. All Rights Reserved. For Intemal Use only.
    Denise A. Dlnie

