

**Case No. 12-M-0476 et al.  
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/  
Technical Working Group (TWG)  
Final Minutes - September 21, 2018**

**Administration**

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted without modifications.
- The Draft Minutes from the 9/7/2018 meeting were adopted as final with modifications to the list of attendees and the date for the next meeting.
- DPS Staff Remarks: None.

**Regulatory Update**

The BWG Chair noted that while there had no specific action impacting EDI since the last working group meeting, with regard to matters in Case No. 18-M-0376, that utilities were providing final DSA submission statistics to DPS Staff for the report on cyber-security matters to be filed on September 24, 2018. The BWG Chair noted that the UBP extension discussed during the Other Business portion of the last meeting was granted to January 4, 2019.

**Updates to EDI Implementation Plan(s)**

a. Current EDI Standards Matrix

The BWG Chair reviewed the matrix noting that the finalized UBR Utility AMT\*7 note is now shown in the matrix. Otherwise, there were no further changes provided during the meeting.

**Next EDI Report**

The BWG Chair announced that the next EDI Report filing would tentatively be scheduled for November 30, 2018. The report will include 814HU Errata, 814C Errata, updated 814C Gray Box Note Conventions and TOP Updates to reflect changes to the updates to the EDM under consideration. 814 HU Gray box note modifications might also be included in the report. The BWG Chair re-iterated that the filing date could change depending upon events in 18-M-0376.

With regard to the gray box note conventions, the BWG Chair reviewed a workpaper showing the proposed modifications standardize the order of the request/response conditionalities/requirements. Utilities were asked to take a close look at gray box notes to ensure that the changes did not inadvertently change the conditionalities/requirements for any segment and to identify any conditionalities/requirements that were incorrect. It is possible that some are incorrect because they are vestige of prior implementations and/or not currently supported by utilities.

The TWG Chair immediately notes a couple item that were not correct; all parties were asked to send their corrections to the BWG Chair. These changes will be reviewed in a workpaper prepared for the next meeting.

### **GISB EDM Discussion**

The BWG Chair reviewed an updated workpaper showing proposed modifications to the TOP guide. There was not much in the way of changes from the last meeting, however, on page 4 of workpaper the options for alternative secure electronic medium when a trading partner's Internet EDI solution is not functioning for 5 consecutive business days, were modified to remove diskettes and tapes and add thumb drives. Eric Heaton (ConEd) asked if there was more generic language than "thumb drive". The BWG Chair asked for suggestions.

The BWG Chair noted that while most parties participating in the EDI Working Group had valid access to the NAESB standards, in order to have a robust review of the changes necessary to the document, it would be better if all parties had access. The BWG will contact the few companies who do not have access to review their options.

With regard to the decision on whether to upgrade NY's current GISB EDM 1.4 to GISB EDM 1.6 or GISB EDM 1.9, the BWG Chair noted the use of the term "best practices" on the Self-Attestation form submitted as a part of the ongoing cyber security matter. The term "best practices" is somewhat ambiguous and so there is some flexibility in how it is applied to NY's EDI Standards. In most retail choice states, GISB EDM 1.6 is the standard. GISB EDM 1.9, in terms of cyber-security and other, is stronger but it is not supported yet in other retail choice states standard even though it is under consideration in Texas. The BWG Chair suggested that simplest course of action is to move to GISB EDM 1.6 but this leaves open the possibility that another move to GISB EDM 1.9 could be required in a few years. Given this possibility, it might be more cost effective to move from GISB EDM 1.4 to GISB EDM 1.9 now.

The TWG Chair stated that it made no sense to move to GISB EDM 1.9 now and casted doubt on the likelihood that Texas would make that decision. Mary Do (Big Data Energy) suggesting that moving to GISB EDM 1.9 will be a lot of work and expensive. In subsequent discussion, the lack of experience handing digital signatures in retail choice implementations (a feature of GISB EDM 1.9) was cited as an obstacle. It would be risky for New York to take a stab at something that is currently not implemented in other retail choice markets.

The BWG Chair suggested that reasonable course of action would be for New York to adopt GISB EDM 1.6 as a standard now and send the issue of upgrading to GISB EDM 1.9 (or higher versions) to the new cyber security working group for further investigation. The TWG Chair agreed noting that New York should have moved to GISB EDM 1.6 more than a decade ago. There was no objection to this approach from other members of the EDI Working Group.

With the decision to adopt GISB EDM 1.6, discussion at next meeting will focus upon modifications to the TOP.

### **Proposed New EDI Transaction - Sync Lists**

The BWG Chair reviewed the workpaper and reiterated the TWG Chair's concerns that for larger ESCOs the resulting transaction would be too for many EDI translators. The TWG Chair suggested that since the motivation for the proposal was reduction of cyber security risk, that other approaches, e.g. secure FTP, might offer a better solution. The BWG Chair agreed and suggested this issue could be addressed by the new cyber security working group that would be created through Case18-M-0376. As a result of today's discussion, the EDI Working Group will discontinue discussion of the sync list proposal.

### **Other Business**

None.

### **Establish Date/Time for Next Meeting**

The next meeting combined BWG/TWG meeting is scheduled for Friday 10/5/2018 at 10 AM.

### **Attendees**

Alan Castro – EC Infosystems	Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems
Emily Cimoli – Clean Choice Energy	Sergio Smiley – National Grid
Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group	Tom Rankin – Marketwise
David Tidman – Customized Energy Solutions	Liz Ciborowski – NYSEG/RGE
Julie Goodchild – Direct Energy	Samantha Curry – Starion Energy
Bobby Hemphry – Constellation	Mary Do – Big Data Energy Services
Amy Delooza – Agway Energy	Mike Day – IGS
Barbara White – Ambit Energy	Mike Novak – National Fuel Gas Dist.
Veronica Munoz – ATMS	David Parnell – Direct Energy
Pete Foster – NYSEG/RGE	Rebecca Sweeney – DPS Staff
Christina Binmore – XOOM Energy	Travis Bickford – Fluent Energy
Jeff Begley – NOCO	Eric Heaton – Con Edison
Jennifer Lorenzini – Central Hudson	Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson
Bianca Marine – O&R	Angela Schorr – Direct Energy
Kim Wall – Hansen Technologies	Diane Neira – NYSEG/RGE
Nicole Barker – National Fuel Gas Dist.	