Pennsylvania enacted the Electricity Generation Customer Choice and Competition Act in 1996 and subsequently launched an electric-choice pilot program. By January 2000, all Pennsylvanians were eligible to select an electric generation supplier. The initiative is expected to cost over $100 million in new startup costs and, thereafter, over $45 million in annual operation and maintenance costs.

The percentage of customers receiving generation from competitive electric suppliers has been declining since 2012, dropping from 47.8% to 17.0%. Participation rates in the competitive supply market for the period through October 2017 are below 50.0%. The percentage of load served by suppliers typically exceeds the percentage of customers served, as most large use commercial and industrial end users. Supplier-related complaints increased significantly during the winter months of 2013-2014, most of them alleging unfair trade practices, deceptive marketing, non-compliance with PURA directives. The report notes that state law allows authority to determine the feasibility of placing these customers on standard service after the freeze period. The report also makes recommendations to reduce the number of price spikes while others passed on the costs to end users.

Proponents’ arguments:

- argues for improved enforcement mechanisms and require suppliers to take improved verification and quality control measures.

By January 2018, net electric-generating facilities had connected to the distribution utilities.

New York banned competitive retailers from enrolling customers who had failed to pay their electric bills. Massachusetts and Vermont also suspended new enrollees.

The ratepayer advocate said that consumer complaints were, is, or will be, directly or indirectly, related to the specific recommendations or views expressed in this report. The report does not consider the differences in types of product offerings from competitive suppliers or the reason why customers opted for a product. RESA questioned the need for additional rules saying that the proceeding did not disclose specific problems that could not be solved through enhanced consumer debt collection procedures.