

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – June 26, 2015**

**Administration**

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted without modification. The Chair noted that an ICAP Notes issue would be discussed under the July 20 Report-Other item.
- The Draft Minutes from the 6/19/2015 EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting were adopted without modification.
- DPS Staff Remarks – None.

**July 20 Report Deliverables**

a. Updates to Report Preparation Web Page – The posted draft EDI Standards changes on the July 20<sup>th</sup> Report Preparation web page are reasonably current with the latest discussion workpapers. If items are changed as of today's discussion, they will be revised as needed. July 10<sup>th</sup> will be the last chance to make changes to documents. Please report changes by that date.

b. Phase I Testing – no update.

c. Phase III Testing – The BWG Chair did not have a chance to review TOP to see if clarification was necessary; this should be done prior to the next meeting. There were no additional comments received on the testing plan reviewed by Central Hudson during the last meeting.

d. Reducing Time between EDI Standards filings and Implementation – no additional comments on documents posted over the last week. The documents are very close to the final form for July 20<sup>th</sup> report.

e. APP Credit Oriented Changes

**Provision of Full Service Billing Amounts – 503 Transaction** – Mary Do (Latitude) asked whether forwarding address is included in the 503 Response. Based upon the sequence of events necessary to calculate an APP Credit, as well as the voluntary use of the 503 transaction, the 814C was the better place to provide a forwarding address (all utilities support the 814C).

The BWG noted a boilerplate statement added to the 503 Business Process (BP) Document that explains how the specific UBPs that guide the business process are incorporated by reference. The statement in the 503 (which needs some refinement) will be placed in each BP Document that following the 'incorporation by reference' convention.

**Reducing APP Credit Transaction Rejection Incidences – 820 Transaction** – A statement was added to the gray box for the RMR Segment to indicate that a rate ready utility using the RMR segment to process other credits in addition to APP Credits should state such in its Utility Maintained EDI Guide. Otherwise, the 820 Implementation Guide was unchanged from last week's discussion where Marie Vajda (NYSEG) reviewed a workpaper showing suggested changes the verbiage in the gray boxes in the 820 Implementation Guide (IG) for data elements RMR04, RMR05, RMR06 and RMR08.

**814C Implementation Guide – APP Credit Example** – A workpaper was reviewed. Barbara Goubeaud (EC Infosystems) and Gary Lawrence (ESG) suggested a better location for the forwarding address than "Service

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – June 26, 2015**

Address” is “Bill To Address”; otherwise the changes to the N3 and N4 Segments were acceptable. The TWG Chair suggested that a rejection reason code should be added to indicate that the APP Credit was being rejected because the customer moved (the new code chosen was MOV). The rejection example was updated to reflect use of the BT segment for forwarding address, i.e. N1\*FE is changed to N1\*BT. The previously proposed FE code will not be added to N1.

Sergio Smiley (National Grid) asked if the 814C will be used for bill ready APP Credits also. The BWG Chair replied stating that 810s would be used when the ESCO was still serving the customer receiving the APP Credit. When the ESCO was no longer serving the customer, since there would be no 867 Monthly Usage, an 814C would be used by a bill ready utility. Barbara Goubeaud asked if the 814C request be modified to reflect usage under both rate ready and bill ready. The BWG Chair said he would look to see if the notes in the 814C BP document need to be updated.

**503 BP Document** – Proposed use of 824 to reject a 503 response will be removed and replaced with a message to have the ESCO contact the utility by email or phone. Utilities generally ignore 824 transactions and ESCOs use non-EDI means to address incorrect utility responses, therefore references to the 503 transaction in the 824 IG will be removed. Later this summer, the 824 IG will be reviewed to remove other transactions that in practice are not rejected using 824s. It was noted that some utilities test the 824 even though they don’t support its use.

**Customer email address in 814E and 814C** – The working group reviewed a workpaper showing changes that would align the PER Segment closer to the same segment in the PANJMD EDI Standards reflecting exchange of fax number and email addresses transactions. The circumstances for exchange of these items via both the 814C and 814E were reviewed in more detail. Further revisions to the 814E PER03 and PER04 segments to align it with the PANJMD will be made. Debbie Rabago (Ambit) asked if the PER02 segment would be added to the NY EDI Standards also. (Note: PER02 is the name associated with the email address). After some discussion, it did not appear as if PER02 would be used so it will not be added, even as an optional item.

f. Other

**814C/E review**– Gary Lawrence discussed his review of the data dictionaries. He noted that the 814E does not have a PER segment in the N1\*BT loop like the 814C; it only has the N1\*8R loop. Mary Do agreed that it should be added. The change will impact both the 814E Data Dictionary and IG.

**ICAP Implementation** – Based upon what NYSEG has learned implementing the ICAP Tag and Future ICAP Tag EDI changes, Charlie Trick identified some changes to the language/remarks in gray boxes to provide a better understanding and/or clarification of how these segments are used. The BWG Chair noted this was the type of item that could be classified as a minor change or errata that would not need Commission approval under the proposed expedited procedures.

**Commission Approval of April 7<sup>th</sup> Report EDI Standards** – Robin Taylor said that based upon the SAPA timeline, an Order could be issued after July 4<sup>th</sup>. The BWG Chair noted that no adverse comments have been received so from a practical perspective, parties probably can proceed as if those changes will be adopted.

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – June 26, 2015**

**Implementation of APP Credits** – The BWG Chair reviewed the progress of development of related matters in a related collaborative. For a variety of reasons, an implementation date is unknown. Further, a piecemeal implementation of the APP Credit process is possible. As a result, the BWG Chair will be filing a request for extension of the EDI testing and implementation deadlines from the March 2<sup>nd</sup> EDI Order.

**Establish date/time for next meeting**

The next meeting will be a combined BWG/TWG meeting on Friday 7/10/2015 at 10 AM.

**Attendees**

Mary Agresti – National Grid	Jeff Begley – NOCO Energy Corp.
Travis Bickford – Fluent Energy	Mary Do – Latitude Technologies
Thomas Dougherty – Aurea Energy Services	Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems
Jason Gullo – National Fuel Resources	Eric Heaton – Con Edison
Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group	Jennifer Lorenzini – Central Hudson
Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson	Veronica Munoz – Accenture
Mike Novak – National Fuel Gas	Jean Pauyo – O&R
Debbie Rabago – Ambit Energy	Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy
Sergio Smilley – National Grid	Alecia Stehnick – Crius Energy
Robin Taylor – DPS Staff	Jasmine Thom – CES
Charlie Trick – NYSEG/RG&E	Marie Vajda – NYSEG/RG&E
Jennifer Vigil – Champion Energy Services	Debbie Vincent – UGI Energy Services
Kim Wall – PPL Solutions	Craig Wiess – National Grid