Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)
Final Minutes – April 11, 2014 Meeting

Administration

- Staff said that it will send feedback from LuAnn Scherer to the BWG on the open issues when it becomes available.
- Draft minutes for the 4/4/2014 meeting were reviewed and finalized without change. Revisions to the attendance list should be sent to Mike Novak or Patrice O'Connor as soon as possible. The Final Minutes will be posted on the web page for the working groups.
- The EDI Working Groups have a web page on the DPS website. The link was forwarded to the group via email.

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

1) **Hourly Interval Settlements**

The general consensus from the April 4th meeting was that this issue needed more research. Integrys asked that each utility should do research on how their meters are being settled. The balance between what can be put into an EDI transaction and what could be done outside of EDI was discussed. A possible outcome was that (Yes/No) information set forth in EDI transactions could be supplemented with some details outside of EDI.

- The clarification question on this issue to Staff is still outstanding.

2) **Enrollment Block—Utility updates regarding access to historical usage**

- Con Ed, O&R and NFG utilize one block for both enrollment and historic usage. If there is a block on the account, Historic Usage will not be returned via EDI, however, it is available online.
- Central Hudson and NYSEG/RG&E utilize separate enrollment blocks and historical usage blocks and populate their EDI transactions accordingly.
- National Grid utilizes separate enrollment blocks and historical usage blocks for their downstate territories and populates their EDI transactions accordingly. For their upstate territory, they only have an enrollment block so historical usage is always provided via EDI.
- ESCOs said it's easier to store information if they can get it via EDI versus utility websites.
- In its design of the EDI transaction, the Technical Working Group (TWG) should consider implementing the "Block on Account" with the following outcomes: Enrollment Block, Historical Usage Block, Both, or None.
    - The TWG has enough information to start working on this transaction.

3) **Utility Discounts**

- The BWG recognizes similarities to the NYPA Incentives issue and is operating under the assumption that this is a "Yes/No". Customer specific details beyond that indication may not be suitable for EDI.
    - The clarification question on this issue to Staff is still outstanding.
- While this may in practice be limited to C&I customers, it may not be possible or necessary to limit the EDI Implementation to these customers. Con Ed noted that it doesn't identify C&I customers in its system.
- In its design of the EDI transaction, the TWG should consider that "Yes" would mean there is a utility discount/incentive rate and "No" would mean there is no discount/incentive rate.
    - The TWG has enough information to start working on this transaction.

4) NYPA Incentives

- The discussion above for Utility Discounts is generally applicable to NYPA Incentives also.
- Question to be address by the utilities:
    - If requested by ESCOs, can utilities provide historic usage on accounts that have NYPA Incentives and what volumes would be given?
    - Are NYPA discounts available to be used for EDI transactions?
        - Central Hudson and NYSEG/RG&E would give full usage but need to verify this information.
- Utilities asked ESCOs if they could obtain this information directly from their potential customers.
- This issue was tabled until the next BWG meeting.

5) Low-income Enrollment Status

The controlling language from page 25 of the February 25, 2014 Order ("Order") is as follows:

> Currently, as part of the process of enrolling a new customer, ESCOs must obtain customer authorization for the utility to release certain information to the ESCO. The information is transmitted via Electronic data interchange (EDI), but does not indicate whether a potential customer is a participant in either a utility low income assistance program or HEAP. In order for the ESCO to obtain this information, two things need to happen. First, the ESCO must seek customer authorization to obtain that information, which requires a modification to the customer authorization rules in the UBP. Second, as discussed above, EDI standards must be modified to provide a field for information on the customer's low income program enrollment status.

Most believed that presuming this to be a "Yes/No" question; EDI Enrollment Transactions could be modified by TWG where "Yes" meant the potential customer is a participant in either a utility low-income assistance program or HEAP and "No" covered all other situations. There was general concern; however, that use of the modified transactions prior to resolving several related issues could be problematic. The following considerations were discussed:

- The utility would have to presume that the customer had given permission for this information to be shared.
    - The DPS/Commission might need to pre-qualify ESCOs that have contracts which allow for customer authorization of release of low-income status.
        - Some ESCOs might choose not to serve low-income customers.
    - Utilities were concerned about providing this information for customers who are currently ESCO customers under contracts which do not provide for authorization for release of this information.
        - Will ESCOs who elect to serve low-income customers be required to modify their contracts to authorization release of low-income status?
        - Absent a requirement to modify existing contracts, the "Yes/No" flag could only be used for new enrollments after some as yet unspecified date.
- The Order was non-specific on how long a customer would be classified as a HEAP recipient.
    - While some customers receive HEAP grants every year, others may or may not receive HEAP depending upon whether they qualify for the program. While a time period of a year or a year plus and unspecified number of months was generally reasonable, it was possible that due to utility specific circumstances each utility might have their own definition.

    - Enrollment change transactions could address cases where customers attain low-income status (or cease to retain low-income status) after they've commence ESCO service.
    - Utilities were asked if all of their HEAP customers get enrolled in low-income programs.
- ESCOs want to know if a customer has low-income status before making their sales pitch. Customers may not be willing to share this information.
    - Utilities would not be able to share this information pre-enrollment because pre-enrollment, the contract would not be in place.
- The TWG can begin work on the EDI enrollment transactions to address low-income participation status however such transactions cannot be implemented because without answer/clarifications to questions raised during the meeting, implementation guides and business process documents to support the transactions would be difficult to develop or otherwise incomplete.
    - The BWG questions whether a collaborative on the low-income issue may be necessary to obtains necessary answers and clarifications. Some believe that further modifications to the UBPs may be needed before this section of the Order can be fully implemented.

Next Meeting

The next BWG meeting will be held on **Friday, April 25, 2014** from 10 am to 2 pm. Agenda Items include:

- Electric customer historic energy usage pattern (continued).
- Customer low-income enrollment status (continued).
- Reject Reason Codes

BWG participants were encouraged to submit workpapers via email to Mike Novak or Patrice O'Connor suggesting new codes and/or discussing how the implementation of current codes could change. The workpapers will be post on the web page.

A meeting will also be scheduled Friday, May 2, 2014. This could be a TWG or BWG meeting depending on the need. The TWG is utilizing email to lay ground work for its first meeting.

Attendees:

Patrice O'Connor—Dept of Public Service Staff	Jason Gullo- National Fuel Resources
Mike Novak- National Fuel	Mary Do – Latitude Technologies
Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group	Jay Sauta- Agway Energy Services
Rock Carbone – Agway Energy Services	Kim Wall – PPL Solutions
Kandi Terry – Just Energy	Kurt Spaeth – Integrys Energy
Charlie Trick – NYSEG/RG&E	Tom Dougherty – I STA
Jennifer Lorenzini – Central Hudson	Cindy Tomeny – National Grid
Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson	Jeff Begley – Fluent Energy
Sergio Smiley – National Grid	Riki Rosenfeld – Direct Energy
Brian Calhoun – Energy Services Group	Juliana Griffiths – National Grid
Tony Cusati – IGS Energy	Debbie Vincent – UGI Energy Services
Rosemary Garlapow – National Fuel Resources	JoAnne Seibel – O&R
Jean Pauyo – O&R	Hollis Krieger – Con Ed
Christine Hughey - Constellation	Gerry Smith – National Grid
Giovanni Formato – Consolidated Edison	Grisel Garcia – Consolidated Edison
Jacqueline Hernandez – Consolidated Edison	