Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)
Final Minutes – May 16, 2014

Administration

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted unmodified.
- Review of Draft Minutes: minutes from the May 9, 2014 BWG meeting were reviewed and no changes other than attendance were suggested. The final minutes will be posted on the EDI Working Group web page.
- The Chair reviewed the high level discussion points from the Low Income Meeting held at the PSC's offices in Albany on May 13, 2014. Two low income workpapers have been circulated for informal comment.

Technical Working Group (TWG) Questions

1) NYPA/Recharge NY Indicator

- Verbiage for the Implementation Guide will be drafted offline and presented at the next BWG meeting. The draft language will address NYPA programs other than ReChargeNY.

2) Utility Discount Indicator

- The draft verbiage for the Implementation Guide was presented. The draft language was modified as follows:

  This is required for non-residential customers and not intended for residential customers. It is not intended for NYPA-related programs including ReChargeNY. The Indicator is intended to differentiate a specific customer from other customers who are similarly situated but do not receive a discount. For example, if every customer within a service classification received the same discount, there would be no need to indicate a discount.

  BWG attendees were instructed to have this modified language reviewed by each company's attorneys.

- Discussion of whether further granularity on "Y" responses to indicate whether the discount applied to supply or delivery took place. It was clarified that the Utility should provide more detailed information in a non-EDI format, upon ESCO request, and that ESCOs should also contact their customers to better understand the discount structure.
  - As utility business systems evolve it may be possible to provide more granularity in and EDI transaction but for now, the decision to have this item remain a "Y/N" indicator was re-affirmed.
- It was clarified that the Utility should indicate a discount in the case where every customer within a service classification receives a discount, but not the same discount.

3) Tax Exemption Indicator

- Draft verbiage for the Implementation Guide was reviewed. ConEd is still having this language reviewed by its attorneys.

- If ConEd suggests revisions to the draft language, it will be discussed at the next BWG call. Otherwise the language will be forwarded to TWG.
- There was discussion on ESCO needs for more detailed information concerning the jurisdiction in which customers are located. Utilities reviewed the information they currently provide outside of EDI.
    - Integrys says the proposed language is fine but would need to know more than just a yes or no flag. Needs the county and district of each service.
    - Some utilities provide Tax District Information on the 867 HU Response.
- The URL for the NYS Tax Department's web site was provided via email.
    - It was noted that this website provides jurisdiction information down to the county level and that subject to check, that may be as detailed as is necessary in some territories.
    - The NYS Tax Department's web site does not include the tax rates for school districts that assess sales tax.

Discussion

1) **Reject Reason Codes (continued)**

- The Commission Order discusses creation of a customer block code that already exists. DPS Staff was informed at the above-mentioned meeting on May 13th to request clarification on this issue.
    - The Chair will contact the leader of the UBP II Working Group for Utility Initiated Drops to determine if that topic was the source of the ESCO requests referenced in the Commission Order.

2) **Low Income Enrollment Status (continued)**

- Discussion was conducted on the presumption that customer privacy/authorization issues would be worked out at some point.
    - The low-income proposals presented at the May 13th meeting took place were briefly reviewed.
- To obtain a customer's low-income program participation status pre-enrollment, an ESCO would need to issue an 814 HU Request.
    - Post-enrollment, the ESCO could issue the same request and in fact, this may be the normal course of action in response to the initial letter the customer would receive pursuant to the Commission's Order.
- The Utility would respond, likely in an 814 HU Response but possibly an 867 HU Response.
    - This will be resolved by TWG; it was noted that an 867 HU response is not provided when there is no historical usage to be presented but that an 814 HU Response would always be provided.
- 814 Changes would be issued by the utility (unsolicited) when customer status changed, i.e. when they begin or cease participating in a low-income program.

3) **Utility Historic Bill Calculator Advisement Transaction**

- The optional nature of this transaction was discussed. While the ESCO has the responsibility of calculating a bill credit, there may be value in ensuring that the historic utility full service billing amounts are unambiguous. Therefore a means for the ESCO to obtain a customer's historic billing amount from the utility could be of assistance in calculating the bill credit.

    - Reaffirming the optional nature of this proposed transaction, it was noted that the utility could provide the same information to the ESCO in a non-EDI format or the ESCO could obtain the information from the customer (who obtained it from the utility using the Historic Bill Calculator)
    - In addition to the low-income customer context, it was noted that the transaction might be useful where ESCOs have offered price guarantees to other customers.
- There was discussion concerning whether it was better to provide 12 monthly amounts in one transaction (in response to an ESCO request) or to have the utility provide the full service amount each month, e.g. through a "Shadow 820", so that an ESCO could build a 12 month history in its system.
- A question was raised concerning bill ready systems might face more difficulty providing the monthly full service amounts that would be faced by rate ready systems.
    - Related discussion addressed whether or not the request for utility full service amounts was always a historical request.
- Each utility will review its internal systems and plans regarding provision of 12 months of full service billing amounts. If there is critical mass, the BWG will continue development of an optional EDI transaction.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on 5/30/14 at 10 am and could be a combined BWG/TWG meeting where the first half of the meeting would be for the BWG and the second half would be for the TWG. Items to be discussed:

- Implementation Guide verbiage
- Reject Reason Codes
- Low Income Program/HEAP Customer Indicator
- Utility Full Service Billing Amount History (Utility Historic Bill Calculator Advisement Transaction)
- Utility Maintained Implementation Guides/Documents

Attendees:

Diane Beard—National Grid	Jeff Begley—Fluent Energy
Rock Carbone—Agway Energy Services	Tom Dougherty--ISTA
Joe Falcon—Ambit Energy	Giovanni Formato—Con Edison
Jason Gullo—National Fuel Resources	Christine Hughey--Constellation
Jackie Hernandez—Con Edison	Donna Satcher-Jackson—National Grid
Jennifer Lorenzini—Central Hudson	Janet Manfredi—Central Hudson
Veronica Munoz--Accenture	Mike Novak—National Fuel Gas
Jean Pauyo—Orange & Rockland	Debbie Rabago—Ambit Energy
Rich Riley—National Grid	Sergio Smilley—National Grid
Joann Seibel—Orange & Rockland	Jay Sauta—Agway Energy Services
Rich Spilky—Integrys Energy	Charlie Trick—NYSEG/RG&E
Cindy Tomeny—National Grid	Rick Tra—National Grid
Carol Teixeria—National Grid	Marc Webster—NYSEG/RG&E
Patrice O'Connor—DPS Staff	Craig Weiss—National Grid