

Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Draft Minutes – April 1, 2016

Administration

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted noting a noting that ICAP Question, 820 Transaction questions , 503 Transaction Questions and an update from the 503 Technical Team would be discussed under the agenda item - Other.
- The Draft Minutes from the 3/11/2016 EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting were adopted as final with a few non-substantive modifications.
- DPS Staff Remarks – None.

Regulatory Update

With regard to the Order Resetting Retail Energy Markets and Establishing Further Process issued on 2/23/2016 in Case 15-M-0127 (“Resetting Order”), a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) has been issued.

A request to extend the 4/1/16 testing deadline for APP Credit Testing to 5/16/2016 was filed with the Secretary – no action has been taken as of yet.

The BWG reviewed mass market product options under consideration in the 15-M-0127 Collaborative Meetings. Three of the options would not require a price guarantee which could impact the demand for the 503 transaction.

Scheduling of Date for Next EDI Report

With consideration given the TRO’s timing implications as well the potential necessity to modify the 503 transaction (and APP Credit related aspects of other transactions), it appears to make sense to bundle the proposed changes developed to date with those necessary to implement the Resetting Order. As a result, the date for the next EDI Report will likely be the end of April or May. If anyone feels that it is necessary to file any of the other EDI work under development prior to then, a narrowly focused EDI report could be filed.

Review of Implementation Plans

Each of the utilities reviewed updates to their schedules. Of note, O&R changes the status of 503 Implementation from T.B.D. to 2016 *** (meaning this year presuming appropriate regulatory action). Additionally, NYSEG/RG&E noted their AMT03 implementation for future ICAP tags. The matrix will be updated for the next meeting including a separate line item for Special Program Indicator.

503 Transaction REF~45 Segment Modifications

A workpaper showing a revised note (to align with 814E gray box note) was discussed. With regard to the segments conditionality, it was unclear if all utilities support the business practice of changing a customer’s account number (and therefore may not support this segment). The question of which utilities support the business process will be discussed offline but then likely course of action is to enhance the gray box note. A workpaper will be prepared for the next meeting; if the language is acceptable it would be used to modify the corresponding gray box note in the 814E IG.

Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Draft Minutes – April 1, 2016

814C/E REF~TD Segment proposal re: PERIC code

A workpaper was reviewed proposing that N18R and N1BT codes instead of the PERIC code. This change, which would align NY's EDI Standards with those in nearby states, would only effect the 814C (the 814E would not be affected). More notes can be added to N1 codes.

Other Business

a. ICAP tag questions

Kris Redanauer reviewed a workpaper questions concerning ICAP tags that had been reviewed during a recent PA-NJ EDEWG meeting. One concern involves an ICAP Tag change during a pending enrollment. Another concern involves when an ICAP Tag is unchanged from year to year, is the ICAP Tag still sent by the utility? A workpaper summarizing utility responses will be prepared for the next EDI Working Group meeting and discussed at next meeting

b. 820 Questions

- Janet Manfredi (Central Hudson) reviewed what they believed was the proper 820 response when APP "debit" is sent. The BWG Chair noted the signage discussion over the past few meetings. After some discussion, it was determined that the answer was best determined off line and that examples for the IG will be developed based upon results.
- Eric Heaton (Con Ed) asked if POR discount would be returned in Dual Billing situations. Previously Staff has directed that they want utilities to provide the APP Credits on customer bills; customers moving outside the territory being the only exception.
 - It was agreed that since the commodity was not billed by the utility (and therefore, POR was never a factor), the discount would not be returned.
- More discussion concerning the utility system remittance complications for cases when the ESCO billed commodity on their own bill.
 - If the ESCO does not have UCB customers with the utility, there is no POR stream against which to retain the APP Credit amounts.
 - The utility would not necessarily send an 820 Transaction to the ESCO if there is no UCB billing for the ESCO providing the APP Credit.
 - If there is no POR stream, can utilities invoice ESCOs prior to issuing APP Credits on customer bills?
 - The BWG Chair agreed to contact Staff apprise them of the issues and see if there were any different alternatives for dual bill situations.

c. 503 Code Postings

Utility web postings regarding codes used to help determine if customers met the Resetting Order's mass market customer definition were reviewed. Meeting participants were directed to contact individual utilities if they had further questions.

Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Draft Minutes – April 1, 2016

d. 503 Transaction Technical Team Status Report

The BWG Chair reviewed a workpaper summarizing the email discussions among the group would begin working off line on the 503 and related transactions to address. The workpaper included flowcharts prepared by Tracie Gaetano (IGS) showing various EDI Transaction scenarios.

There were four preliminary proposals with respect to Resetting Order EDI development:

1. Status quo – effectively no changes other than renaming certain items.
2. Because there will be many more requests relative to what had been presumed for APP Credits, reconfigure 503 into a monthly transaction.
 - a. Rate Ready utilities they would send an 867, 810, and 503.
 - b. Bill Ready would send the 503 with the 824 since they wouldn't know the ESCO charges when they send the 867.
 - c. ESCOs would be responsible for managing the monthly 503 history in their business systems.
3. Retain the 24 month format but the utility would create the 503 for all ESCO accounts on a scheduled basis (each billing cycle, once week, once a month?)
4. Modify EDI Standards to permit any of these possibilities but leave it up to the utility on how best to implement with respect to their billing system.

EDI Working Group participants were asked to consider the alternatives before the next meeting. Based upon the discussion, IGS will provide updated flowcharts.

Establish date/time for next meeting

The next meeting will be a combined BWG/TWG meeting on Friday 4/15/2016 at 10 AM.

Case 12-M-0476, et. al.
EDI Business Working Group (BWG)/
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Draft Minutes – April 1, 2016

Attendees

Mary Agresti – National Grid	Lois Anderson – National Grid
Jeff Begley – NOCO	Travis Bickford – Fluent
Rock Carbone – Agway	Mary Do – Latitude
Tracie Gaetano – IGS	Grisel Garcia – Con Ed
Barbara Goubeaud – EC Infosystems	Jason Gullo – National Fuel Resources
Anna Harley - ?	Eric Heaton – Con Ed
Ethan Kagan – Direct Energy	Gary Lawrence – Energy Services Group
Jennifer Lorenzini – Central Hudson	Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson
Kim McNary – Ambit	John Mochipach – Engie
Mike Pawlowski - National Grid	Mike Novak – NFGD
Jean Pauyo – O&R	Adam Powers – Ethical Electric
Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy	Donna Satcher-Jackson – National Grid
Sergio Smilley – National Grid	Jasmine Thom – CES
Cindy Tomeny – National Grid	Marie Vajda – NYSEG/RG&E
Jennifer Vigil – Champion	Debbie Vincent – UGI
Kim Wall – PPL Solutions	Barbara White – Ambit
Craig Wiess – National Grid	Amie Williams – Agway
Robin Taylor – DPS Staff	Tom Dougherty - Marketwise