

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

Administration

Meeting materials will be circulated via an email list.

- Working group members are responsible for circulating materials within their companies.
- Patrice O'Connor will maintain the master contact list.
 - Requests to join the list should be sent to Patrice.OConnor@dps.ny.gov
- A web page that will be accessible from the Department of Public Service web site.
 - The web page will also contain meeting agendas, meeting notes and other documents that are produced by the groups.
 - The master contact list will be linked to the web page.

Process

The goal of these working groups is to produce EDI data sets that work and that are responsive to the PSC's order.

- The Business Working Group (BWG) will determine the business requirements for the EDI transactions discussed in Orders issues in Cases 12-M-0476 et. al.
 - BWG is the "what" group, i.e. what information will be exchanged.
- When the BWG has determined the requirements for a transaction, the work products will be forwarded to the Technical Working Group (TWG) for development/modification of EDI Transaction Standards and related documents.
 - TWG is the "how" group, i.e. how information will be exchanged.
- Minutes will be produced the week after each meeting and posted on the web site.

BWG leadership:

ESCO: Richard Spilky, Utility: Mike Novak, EDI Service Provider: Jeff Begley

TWG leadership:

Utility: Charlie Trick, EDI Service Provider: Kim Wall, ESCO: To Be Determined

Meetings will generally be held weekly by teleconference

- The initial meetings will be BWG meetings.
- TWG meetings will start once the BWG has completed work products ready for technical development.
- At some point, it is likely that BWG and TWG meetings will alternate each week.
- If the TWG determines that BWG work products are not sufficient to develop EDI transaction standards, they will seek further explanation from the BWG.
- If the BWG does not have sufficient guidance from the Orders in 12-M-0476 et.al., it will seek further guidance from DPS Staff.
- It is recognized that on some issues, Staff will be unable to provide guidance and parties may have to rely upon the regulatory process for resolution.

Discussion: Business Requirements for Electric Customer Historic Energy Usage Pattern Transactions

The group used Richard Spilky's spreadsheet and Kim Wall's questions as a guide for the discussion. Information on the spreadsheet summarized how utilities currently provide this historic information and suggested formats for getting the data. The "Xs" across the top of the spreadsheet are Richard's interpretation as to which items were in the Commission's order. The general operating premise is that the current 867 Historical Usage transaction would be modified to accommodate the requested information.

1) ICAP Tag

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs need this information in advance of contracting with the customers. Several data considerations were noted:

- The ICAP Tag is already provided in enrollment response (814 Request from ESCOs).
- If the account has not been established with the utility for a few weeks, the ICAP tag information may not be available.
 - Utilities said that newly opened accounts won't have an ICAP tag until after the customer is billed.
 - ESCOs would like to have the utilities provide as much information as possible for new customers.
 - When there is not enough information to populate the transaction for new accounts, a designation that there is not enough information in the transaction would be useful.
 - TWG will determine whether ICAP tag unavailability will be represented by providing no code or whether a new code needs to be added.
 - Information should be included in the business process and implementation guides addressing this issue.
- The effective dates for the ICAP Tags are May 1- April 30. A question was raised regarding how to get the new ICAP tags in May if the ESCOs enroll a new customer in April.
 - The utilities said they would have to request the historic usage again or they could obtain the information from the utility web sites. The ESCOs would not get this information automatically.
- A question was raised whether the EDI transaction could include both the current ICAP Tag, and when available, the future ICAP Tag (with appropriate effective dates).
 - Some utilities noted that future ICAP Tags aren't stored in their customer information systems but may be available on their web sites or the customer list file.
 - Since future ICAP Tags weren't addressed in the Commission Order and data availability varies, this issue is not suitable for development at this time.
- A question was raised whether New York utilities send this information annually via the 814 Change, in addition to presenting information on the 867 Historical Usage.
 - Some utilities do but others either use email or were not sure.

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

- It was noted that utilities do not expect 814C responses for mass updates like ICAP tags and do not wish to receive them.

Kim Wall said she has enough information on the ICAP tag issue for the TWG to start working on this issue.

2) Meter Numbers

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs would like to receive the number of meters an account as well as the meter numbers themselves. Several data considerations were noted:

- Utility metering practices vary among utilities. Some may have one meter per account while others may have multiple meters per account.
 - There was discussion whether the EDI Transaction should impose a limit on the number of meters. One utility objected and from a practical perspective, it may not matter. TWG will investigate practices from other states and would like to that allow multiple meters per account to provide the maximum number they experience.
- Where there are multiple meters on an account, there can be different types; a mix of summary, interval and unmetered (estimated) usage.
 - When a mix is present, ESCOs would like to know the meter type, i.e. summary, interval, or unmetered.
 - Further utility research may be necessary for the TWG.

Kim Wall said she has what she needs on this issue to take it to the Technical Group. She has a design prepared that should work for this item.

3) Hourly Interval Settlements

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs need to know if hourly or profile (shaped) volumes will be sent to the NYISO for settlements. The preference is for each account to possess a “flag” indicating whether or not it will be settled utilizing an actual hourly or a class shape methodology when served by the ESCO for NYISO settlement purposes. Several data considerations were noted:

- More explanation is needed because of the complexity of the issue. How a meter is settled is not necessarily a function of meter type.
 - Regular meters are settled via NYISO but interval meters, may or may not be settled using hourly data.
 - O&R noted that settlement is at the LSE level and not at the individual account.
 - ESCOs acknowledge this but we want to know at the account level how it is being settled, i.e. with the class shape or with the actual interval data itself (when it exists).
 - The level of consistency among utilities was not apparent; some practices seem to vary.

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

The general consensus was that this issue needed more research and could not be resolved at during the current meeting. Kim Wall and Richard Spilky will come up with a list of questions to circulate to the BWG. The issue will be revisited at the next meeting.

4) Enrollment Block

Enrollment Blocks were not addressed in the context of Historical Usage Transactions in the Commission Order, however, they would likely be included in development additional reject reason codes (required in the Order). A reject reason code would be provided after an ESCO attempted enrollment and they would prefer to know beforehand so that the customer can be asked to contact the utility to remove the block.

After some discussion, there was general agreement that if utility systems could accommodate the ESCO request, the utility should have the option to use the historical usage transaction to meet this request. The TWG could provide an element in the EDI transaction but it would be voluntary, not mandatory, for the utility to populate the element.

- Kim Wall said the TWG will need examples of current utility practices for the Implementation Guides.

An ancillary issue with whether and enrollment block prevents an ESCO from receiving the customer's historical usage information.

- Utilities will investigate and report back to the BWG.
- The ESCO preference is for the utility to continue to provide historical usage when an enrollment block is in place, but to provide a "yes/no" flag in the historical usage transaction indicating that an enrollment block is in place.
 - This will enable the ESCO to work with customer on pricing and contract terms while at the same time, working with the customer to follow the utility enrolment block removal process so as to ensure that the enrollment block is removed prior to contracting and/or enrolling.

The TWG may be able to start working on this issue but more information will be needed before it can be completed.

5) Tax Exempt

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs need to know whether the utility shows the customer as tax exempt in its system. ESCOs say they need this information to need to know how the utility is treating the customer with respect to tax exempt status to know the overall economics of dealing with the customer. Richard Spilky also requested further details on exemptions as well as jurisdictional status based upon the service address. Several considerations were noted:

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

- While the Order requires a status indicator, ESCOs should gather their own tax exemption information from the customers, i.e. they should not rely solely upon the Utility's information.
 - To help distinguish tax treatment of the ESCO's commodity from utility treatment of delivery charges, the TWG may elaborate in the Implementation Guides, e.g. based upon how the element is populated the account should be identified as "tax exempt for delivery".
 - There is value in providing the tax exempt status to the ESCO even if they don't rely upon the information. At the very least, it is a "head's up" to the ESCO that they need to contact the customer to obtain the appropriate paperwork to justify the exemption for ESCO records.

6) Utility Delivery Discounts

It is unclear whether the Order requires this information because the language can be read to only include NYPA/ ReCharge NY incentives. Minimally, ESCOs are looking for a "yes/no" flag regarding whether the discounts exist and if "yes", a "yes/no" flag on whether the incentives would not be available if the customer took ESCO Service. ESCOs would also like further granularity on the amount of consumption to which incentives or discounts could be applied. Several considerations were noted:

- For some utilities, these customers are billed outside the CIS system thus the data to support an indicator may not be available.
- There is a presumption this information would only be applicable to C&I customers.

The general consensus was that this issue needed more research and could not be resolved at during the current meeting. DPS Staff should clarify whether the language in the Order applies beyond the context of NYPA/ ReCharge NY incentives. Further DPS Staff should clarify whether this requirement is greater than a "yes/no". Utilities will do further research on the types of discounts and incentives provided. The issue will be revisited at the next meeting.

7) NYPA Incentives (ReCharge NY)

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs need to know whether customer is receiving NYPA/ ReCharge NY incentives. Again, ESCOs would also like further granularity on the amount of consumption to which incentives or discounts could be applied while Utilities believe this is a "yes/no" element. Several data considerations were noted:

- There is a presumption this information would only be applicable to C&I customers.
- For some utilities, these customers are billed outside the CIS system thus the data to support an indicator may not be available.
- Even if an indicator can be provided, Utilities may not be able to provide NYPA data.
 - ESCOs are willing to receive applicable usage history data in non-EDI formats.

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

The general consensus was that this issue needed more research and could not be resolved at during the current meeting. DPS Staff should clarify whether this requirement is greater than a “yes/no”. The issue will be revisited at the next meeting.

8) SIC Codes

Required by the Commission Order, SIC codes are standard four digit code and usually one per account. Some utilities use NAICS codes which are six digits long. The codes are not available for every customer and not at all from Con Ed. The absence of a code is an indication that it's not available and this should be noted in the implementation guide.

The TWG has sufficient information to start working on this issue.

9) Supplied by Utility

Required by the Commission Order, ESCOs would like to know this because knowing if a customer is currently served by the utility it enables the ESCO to customize their communication to prospective customers. Knowing this also helps determine if a prospective customer may be able to switch immediately. This element should be a “yes/no” flag. If the customer is with the utility it would be “yes” and if they are served by an ESCO, “no”.

The TWG has sufficient information to start working on this issue.

Items that are on Richard Spilky's spreadsheet but are not in the Commission Order

Service Address/Billing Address

ESCOs would like both addresses. The service address is already in the Implementation Guide. ESCOs looking for pre-enrollment and they would want the billing address for their contacts. Utilities believe the ESCO can obtain this information directly from the customer pre-enrollment. Further, post-enrollment utilities will provide the information via other EDI Transactions post-enrollment.

Off-System Histories

There was further discussion regarding “off-system” history primarily related to ReCharge NY. ESCOs are asking for historic usage data in a specific format when that usage data is not available under standard methods.

Meeting adjournment

The next meeting of the BWG will be 4/11/2014 – 11 AM to 3 PM

Case No. 12-M-0476 et. al.
EDI Business Working Group
Draft Minutes - April 4, 2014 Meeting

Attendees

Patrice O'Connor - Department of Public Service	Diane Beard - National Grid
Mike Novak - National Fuel	Janet Manfredi - Central Hudson
Richard Spilky - Integrys Energy	Jeff Begley - Fluent Energy
Vicky Gilmore - Energy Services Group	Vivian Lamonica - NYSEG/RG&E
Jason Gullo - National Fuel Resources	Sergio Smiley - National Grid
Mary Do - Latitude Technologies	Riki Rosenfeld - Direct Energy
Gary Lawrence - Energy Services Group	Brian Calhoun - Energy Services Group
Jay Sauta - Agway Energy Services	Juliana Griffiths - National Grid
Rock Carbone - Agway Energy Services	Tony Cusati - IGS Energy
Kim Wall - PPL Solutions	Debbie Vincent – UGI Energy Services
Marc Webster - NYSEG/RG&E	Rosemary Garlapow - National Fuel Resources
Terence McInerney - Agway Energy Services	Usher Fogel
Russ Thackston - New York Natural Gas	Donald Kennedy - O&R
Kandi Terry - Just Energy	Bob Melvin - O&R
Kurt Spaeth - Integrys Energy	JoAnne Seibel - O&R
Charlie Trick - NYSEG/RG&E	Jean Pauyo - O&R
Ed Brolin - Constellation	Jackie Hernandez - Con Ed
Jodi Larison – UGI Energy Services	Hollis Krieger - Con Ed
Tom Dougherty - ISTA	Grisel Garcia - Con Ed
Jennifer Lorenzini - Central Hudson	Giovanni Formato - Con Ed
Cindy Tomeny - National Grid	Brian Meredith - IGS Energy