

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – May 22, 2015**

**Administration**

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted without modification.
- The Draft Minutes from the 5/8/2015 EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting were adopted as Final without modification.
- DPS Staff Remarks – None.

**July 20 Report Deliverables**

- a. Phase I Testing
  - No update.
- b. Phase III Testing
  - No update.
- c. Reducing Time between EDI Standards Filing and Implementation

The BWG Chair reviewed a workpaper that included 1) an excerpt from a 1999 Order in Case 97-G-1380 creating the process by which utility GTOPs are filed and 2) design considerations for the proposed expedited EDI Standards review process. Comments provided by National Grid prior to the meeting addressed whether just major initiatives should be excluded from the process or all new initiatives. Since some new initiatives could be relatively inconsequential from an EDI perspective, it was determined that the EDI Working Group could look at each new initiative and make a recommendation as to whether it qualified for expedited treatment. Post filing, a party could use the review process to be included in the expedited EDI Standards review process or the regulatory process (a letter to the Secretary) to dispute a recommendation for expedited treatment.

A workpaper organizing the proposed expedited EDI Standards review process in a more formal structure will be prepared for the next EDI Working Group Meeting.

- d. Reducing APP Credit Rejection Incidences

A workpaper identifying proposed modifications permitting use of 820 EDI transactions to notify ESCOs when APP Credits to customers they no longer serve have been processed by the utility. It was noted that for bill ready systems, in cases when there is no monthly usage the ESCO would use an 814C transaction (instead of an 810) to provide the APP Credit to the utility.

After some discussion concerning the remaining cases where the utility could not process the APP Credit, it was determined that when a customer has moved out of a utility's territory, the utility should receive the forwarding address (if available) in the 814C rejection.

During discussion, it was determined that when the utility provides the APP Credit on a customer bill, the corresponding 820 should reflect a return of the amount retained under POR.

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – May 22, 2015**

The example in the RMR Remittance Advice Accounts Receivable Open Item Reference segment for a \$100 APP Credit under a POR program with 1% retainage will be changed as follows:

RMR~12~000141679~AJ~-101.00~-100.00~1.00~GR~-100.00

Where:

RMR04 is amount paid to the supplier  
RMR05 is what goes to the customer  
RMR06 is adjustment to the prior POR retainage  
RMR08 is adjustment amount

A utility may use non-EDI alternatives to communicate when it processes an adjustment on a customer's bill but no 820 transaction exists to upon which to reflect an adjustment to the POR amounts transferred. This could occur if the ESCO is no longer active in a utility's UCB POR program but still issues dual bills (or Single Retailer bills) or if an ESCO has exited a utility's customer choice program. In such cases, the utility could require the ESCO to prefund the APP Credits or reject the transaction and thereby require the ESCO to issue the credit to the customer directly.

A list of circumstances in which the ESCO will have to provide the APP Credit will be identified in the July 20 Report and in the Business Process Documents. An updated workpaper will be prepared for the next EDI Working Group Meeting.

e. Provision of Full Service Billing Amounts – Proposed 503 EDI Transactions

An initial draft 503 Implementation Guide (IG) workpaper, providing proposed segments and examples, was reviewed. Discussion concerning delivery sales tax rules as well as the required from the Orders in 12-M-0476 helped to determine which items would be needed by the ESCO to calculate the APP Credit and which items, provided on an optional or conditional basis, could provide other useful information to the ESCO. Other key points raised during discussion were as follows:

- Because the 503 rejection would not include an ASI segment, an example should be included in the IG
- Under the bill ready model, ESCOs may only send budget amounts so utilities may not have actual charges.
  - The APP Credit should be based upon actual, not budget, charges.
  - The ESCO is ultimately responsible for determining the customer actual supply charges so utility provided ESCO charges may be essentially informational.
- In any event, the 503 Transaction is utility optional – the utility is required to provide information but no particular method is required.
  - Utilities may use non-EDI means, e.g. modifications to their web site historic bill calculators or a web file, to provide ESCOs with access to utility billing amounts.

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/**  
**Technical Working Group (TWG)**  
**Final Minutes – May 22, 2015**

- At this point, National Fuel and National Grid are inclined to use the 503 transaction.

Workpapers showing further revisions to the Draft IG as well as initial drafts for the data dictionary and business process document will be prepared for the next EDI Working Group Meeting.

f. Other

- Upon review, NYSEG observed that the HUL code appeared to be missing from the 814E Response – Segment REF~1P (the HUL code can be provided in the 814HU Response – Segment REF~1P). After a brief discussion of the business process, the TWG Chair agreed and a correction will be made to the Implementation Guide. The BWG Chair noted that this instance was the type of circumstance that would be addressed under an expedited process.

**Establish date/time for next meeting**

The next meeting will be a combined BWG/TWG meeting on Friday 6/12/2015 at 10 AM.

**Attendees**

Alecia Stehnick – Crius Energy	Jim Stauble – Avanade
Amie Williams – Agway Energy	JoAnne Seibel – Central Hudson
Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems	Joe Falcon – Ambit Energy
Charlie Trick – NYSEG/RG&E	Kim Wall – PPL Solutions
Craig Weiss – National Grid	Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy
Debbie Rabago – Ambit Energy	Marie Vajda – NYSEG/RG&E
Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group	Mary Do – Latitude Technologies
Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson	Mike Novak – National Fuel Gas
Jean Pauyo – Orange & Rockland	Sergio Smilley – National Grid
Jeff Begley – NOCO Energy	Thomas Dougherty – Aurea Energy
Jennifer Vigil – Champion Energy	Veronica Munoz – Accenture