

Case No. 12-M-0476 et al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Final Minutes – July 14, 2017

Administration

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted noting that discussion in response to a late workpaper from Marketwise would be discussed during Other Business.
- The Draft Minutes from the 6/30/2017 meetings were adopted as final without modification.
- DPS Staff Remarks: None.

Regulatory Update

The NYS Supreme Court issued an order which supports the Commission relative to Low-Income Prohibition matter. As such, the last extension date (July 26) will be implementation of low-income prohibition. It is possible that further court action may take place, however for planning purposes the expectation that July 26th will be the implementation date.

Updates to EDI Implementation Plan(s)

a. Current EDI Standards Matrix

Con Ed noted that Phase III testing date should begin sometime next week; as soon as Phase II testing is completed. Con Ed and O&R received extension on testing (APP credit testing for 814C) until September 2, 2017. For NYSEG/RGE, the 814C~AMT7 date was revised back to “TBD****”; it had been revised in error. O&R’s 867MIU/HIU implementation was postponed beyond July but a new date has not been set yet.

b. Prohibition Order Matrix

The matrix reflects 7/26 as implementation date. The initial availability dates should be available at the next meeting.

Next EDI Report Filing

a. 867HIU/MIU Related Updates

- No more errata has been found; the 814C changes for missing codes found during the last meeting are now incorporated into the draft guides.
- It was clarified that the 867 HIU/MIU are voluntary transactions; utilities can use a non-EDI approach if better suited for their smart metering implementation.
 - To the extent other utilities want to use the 867 HIU/MIU transactions it is understood that changes, as necessary, beyond the initial documents will be made.

814D IG – Prohibition on Termination Fees at Account Closure

A posted workpaper from National Fuel was reviewed which reviewed commercially available products/services that ESCOs could rely upon to satisfy the new law that prohibits termination fees when

customer passes away. While the proposed 814D REF~1P~DEC code works from a technical perspective, utilities believe they are not the most reliable source for this EDI transaction because they don't always know if the customer has passed away.

It was also noted that utilities do not bill termination fees for ESCOs on UCB bills; such fees are billed to the customer by the ESCOs. Reversing a termination fee is therefore an ESCO billing matter and each ESCO may have different standards for proof of death.

The BWG Chair asked that ESCOs to read through the workpaper so that discussion at the next meeting could address whether there is need for new EDI transaction.

814D – Business Process – Customer Moves/Account Closure

Work paper has been posted revising proposed modifications to language in the 814D Business process document to reflect the actual business practices of most utilities regarding account closure when a customer moves (or calls to say they are moving). The 814D reflects a process whereby utilities are supposed to notify ESCOs in advance of customer moves but in practice, most utilities have stated they only instruct company that customer has moved after the account has been closed.

Utilities generally believe that their current practice is accurate information because it notifies the ESCO when account terminates and customer has moved. In many cases, customers don't move on the dates they initially provide to the utility so the pending drop notifications sent by utilities to ESCOs contain inaccurate dates. The original intent of advanced notification was in part to inform the ESCO if the customer is moving within same service territory which would create an opportunity for continuous ESCO service (referred to as a seamless move in some jurisdictions).

Two 814D segments (REF~1P and DTM~007) were also included in the workpaper; the suggestion was that these segments could be modified either to enhance the gray box notes or reflect that an initial notification of a customer move, i.e. the pending drop, was informational and that the final drop notification, after the account was closed would be the standard process. It was noted that an ESCO could initiate its own drop once it received the pending drop if it chose to do so or it could do nothing which at least in some territories meant they would continue to serve the customer.

The TWG Chair asked why an 814 MOV transaction wasn't used to provide ESCOs with advance notice of a customer move but another working group member noted that the 814 MOV was not supported in NY; it was a PJM EDI transaction. The TWG Chair then asked why it was necessary to inform the ESCO of a customer move date. The BWG Chair replied that he recalled the information might be useful to assist the ESCO in continuing to serve the customer if the move was within the utility's service territory.

Kris Redanauer (Direct Energy) initiated further discussion regarding how utilities handle customer moves with suppliers. The BWG Chair said he believed ConEd supported a seamless move EDI transaction; Angel Alvarez (Con Ed) will verify. National Fuel doesn't have a specific EDI transaction but has a process that relies upon existing EDI transactions to effect a seamless move. Charlie Trick (NYSEG/RG&E) noted they also had a business process that works so long as sufficient advance notice is provided (at least 15 days).

The BWG Chair asked ESCOs to provide their point of view on the proposed changes so that the working group could determine the next steps for development.

Change Control Process

The BWG Chair reviewed the Change Control Process web page which was developed by DPS Staff since the last meeting. The table on the web page contained links to the request and workpapers discussed at past meetings. Currently the only item in the web page table was a request concerning Prohibition on Termination Fees at Account Closure.

TOP Supplement 1 – Alternative Phase II/III Testing Definitions

The BWG Chair reviewed proposed alternate Phase II/III definitions for utility testing outside of that specified in New York’s EDI Standards, e.g. 867HIU/MIU testing or utility implementation of a new billing system. There were no questions from the working group.

Other Business

The EDI working group reviewed a workpaper from Marketwise concerning various aspects of Prohibition Order implementation, in particular, 503 transaction questions, transactions used to send credits and related implementation details. Otherwise, there was no new business.

Establish Date/Time for Next Meeting

The next meeting is a combined BWG/TWG meeting on Friday 7/28/2017 at 10 AM.

Attendees

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Charlie Trick – NYSEG/RGE | Veronica Munoz – Accenture |
| Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems | Jeff Begley – NOCO Energy Corp |
| Juliana Griffiths – National Grid | Elois Anderson – National Grid |
| Craig Weiss – National Grid | Angela Schorr – National Grid |
| Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group | Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy |
| Adam Powers – Clean Choice Energy | Rick Malek – National Grid |
| Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson | Bianca Merine – O&R |
| Mike Pawlowski – National Grid | Jasmine Acosta – CES |
| Jen Lorenzini – Central Hudson | Mary Do – Latitude |
| Liz Ciborowski – NYSEG/RGE | Mike Novak – National Fuel Gas Dist. |
| Sergio Smilley – National Grid | Amy Delooza – Agway Energy Services |
| Thomas Dougherty – Marketwise | Rebecca Sweeney – DPS Staff |
| Travis Bickford – Fluent Energy | Angel Alvarez – Con Ed |
| Rachel Frye – Direct Energy | Dave Miller - IGS |
| David Parnell – Direct Energy | Cindy Tomeny – National Grid |
| Kim Wall – Hansen Technologies | |