

Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Draft Minutes – June 24, 2016

Administration

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted with addition of a review of Segment Conditionality for the 503 Transaction.
- The Draft Minutes from the 6/17/2016 EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting were adopted without modification.

Regulatory Update

- Nothing new to report.

6/30/2016 EDI Report

a. 503 IG

Current Bill Option

- A workpaper showing modifications to the REF Reference Identification (Reject Response Reasons) segment and a new segment, REF Reference Identification (Response Information or Warning) prepared by Mary Do (Latitude) was reviewed. The BWG Chair noted that while the more immediate purpose of the new segment convey whether the utility was currently sending a bill to the customer to give the ESCO advanced notice of whether they would need to provide the EPA Credit directly to the customer, the new segment could be used by the utility to convey any relevant information to the ESCO by using the A13 code. Based upon experience the 503 segment after it is implemented, it's possible that the EDI Working Group made add more codes at some future date. There was no additional discussion; the modifications and additions from the workpaper will be included in the 503 IG for the 6/30/ 2016 EDI Report.

Review of Segment Conditionality

- The BWG Chair identified the 503 IG workpaper from the 6/17 meeting as relevant for discussion. The reason for the review is that based upon emails exchanged during the past week, the working group may have erred in changing some of the segment conditionalities for the EPA Credits. Specifically, the AMT Monetary Amount (Actual Total) segment should likely have remained mandatory so that utility delivery charges are provided in Dual Bill scenarios.
- For the purpose of this discussion, there are five relevant segments:

- o 110 AMT Monetary Amount (Utility Comparison Amount)
 - o 110 AMT Monetary Amount (Actual Total)
 - o 110 AMT Monetary Amount (ESCO Supply Charges)
 - o 110 AMT Monetary Amount (Utility Supply Comparison Charges)
 - o 120 REF Reference Identification (Bill Option)
- The BWG Chair pointed out that the purpose of the 503 EDI transaction is to provide information to the ESCO so that the ESCO may calculate the EPA Credit.
- There clearly has been some confusion among some ESCOs and EDI Service Providers about whether the EPA Credit calculation is based upon supply charges or total bill amounts. The BWG Chair clarified that based upon the February 2014 Order in Case 12-M-0476, et.al. the EPA Credit is to be calculated on the total bill amount (like the utility web historic bill calculators).
 - o The Commission's decision was in part based upon the observation that customers look at bottom line amounts.
- In the most basic scenario, if the ESCO is using UCB, Utility Total Charges (AD) and Actual Total Charges (CX) tells the whole story for the credit calculation. If over the up to 12 month period, the sum of AD - CX is a negative number, then that amount is the EPA Credit.
- The 503 has been designed so that utility would provide ESCO Supply Charges (T3) but from a EPA Credit perspective, that amount doesn't provide anything useful because the prior two components provide all that is necessary.
- In the case of Dual billing, Actual Total Charges (CX) will consist of the delivery charges only. ESCO Supply (T3) will be zero. The ESCO knows what it billed; it adds that amount to the (CX) amount and does the comparison as described above, i.e. comparing it to (AD). In Dual billing situations, Utility Supply (TR) can be approximated by subtracting (CX) from (AD) but that's not a useful calculation for the customer because the comparison is not between supply charges; it is between total bill charges.
- For Single Retailer, the Actual Total Charges (CX) will be zero. The ESCO compares its total ESCO billed amount to (AD) to calculate the EPA credit.
- The BWG Chair observed that while the Utility Supply (TR) segment could be calculated, he did not think there was value in providing the amount relative to the purpose of the segment. The TWG Chair questioned whether providing the segment was misleading. The tax treatment of the delivery charges, for some customers based upon whether or not they received supply service from the ESCO, prevents a simple addition of delivery and supply charges.
- Central Hudson and National Fuel did not plan to support the and National Grid all determined they will not be supporting AMT Monetary Amount (Utility Supply Comparison Charges) segment; the other utilities need to review before committing either way. Sergio Smiley (National Grid) suggested that the segment should remain in the 503 but should be optional.
- The 503 IG to be filed on 6/30/2016 will be based upon the following:
 - o The AMT Monetary Amount (Utility Comparison Amount) segment will be mandatory.

- The AMT Monetary Amount (Actual Total) will be required but the gray box notes will explain how it should be populated relative to the bill type in the REF Reference Identification (Bill Option) segment. The contents of the segment will be identified via the contents of the REF Reference Identification (Bill Option). In the case of ESCO Combined Billing, the utility should send a 0 (zero) amount because it does not bill the customer
 - The AMT Monetary Amount (ESCO Supply Charges) segment will remain conditional as determined during the 6/17 meeting; it is only available if the utility issues a consolidated bill.
 - The AMT Monetary Amount (Utility Supply Comparison Charges) segment will be option, i.e. the condition is if supported by the utility. Those utilities who choose to support this segment should note such in the Utility EDI Guides.
 - The REF Reference Identification (Bill Option) segment will be mandatory.
- Based upon a request from Barbara Goubeaud (EC Infosystems), the Utility ESCO Pricing Adjustment Support workpaper reviewed at working group meetings will be reflected to record which 503 segments will be supported by each utility.
 - The TWG Chair suggested that the examples in the 503 IG will need to be modified to delete the REF*TR (Utility Supply Comparison Charges) lines.

b. Recap of Modified Standards Documents

- The EDI Working Group plans to file modified EDI Standards documents on June 30, 2016. Other than the 814HU IG and 820 IG, the proposed EDI Standards documents changes were identical to those referenced at the 6/10/2016.

c. Changes to 820, 503 and 814C EDI Standard documents

- No further discussion.

d. Changes to EDI Standard documents other than 820, 503 and 814C

- No further discussion.

Other Business

Future (after the 6/30/2016 has been filed) EDI Working Group discussion items:

- Determining a process by which a new EDI Service Providers could become qualified as an “experienced” EDISP and corresponding technical document modifications.
- Jason Miller (Con Ed) contacted the BWG Chair to express a need to develop Interval Usage EDI transactions to support their advanced metering installations. Some states have 867IU datasets which could be utilized as a basis for developing a NY 867IU transaction. Anyone interested in developing this new transaction should contact Mr. Miller directly; the working group will begin discussion at the first meeting

Establish date/time for next meeting

The next meeting will be a combined BWG/TWG meeting on Friday 7/22/2016 at 10 AM.

Attendees

Adam Powers – Ethical Electric	Jeff Begley – NOCO
Amie Williams – Agway	John Cooney – National Grid
Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems	Kim McNary – Ambit
Barbara White – Ambit	Kim Wall – PPL Solutions
Bonnie Lamont – O&R	Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy
Charlie Trick – NYSEG/RG&E	Marie Vajda – NYSEG/RG&E
Craig Wiess– National Grid	Mary Agresti – National Grid
Debbie Rabago – Ambit	Mary Do – Latitude
Debbie Vincent – UGI Energy Services	Mike Novak – National Fuel Gas Dist.
Debra Croche – EC Infosystems	Nicholas Shuart??? – Hudson Energy
Ethan Kagan – Direct Energy	Rick Malek – National Grid
Ewen Ng – EARTH Corporation	Rock Carbone – Agway
Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group	Sergio Smilley – National Grid
Honor Harley – Accenture	Tom Dougherty – Marketwise
Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson	Tracie Gaetano – IGS
Jennifer Lorenzini – Central Hudson	Travis Bickford – Fluent Energy