

EDJ Standards Changes:	Filed	Order Issued	Ordered Testing Completion	Ordered Implementation Date	Central Hudson	Con Edison	Nat. Grid - Update	Nat. Grid - Downstate	NFG	NYSEG	O&R	RG&E	PSEG-LI
APP Items - Round 1 & Other Changes:													
B10UBR/B10URR: the addition of the CRE030 SAC04 Charge Type			7/3/2017	approx 1 mo following Prohibition Order implementation	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	
Utility B14C AMT*7 Implemented					Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented ###	Implemented	Manual Proc ###	Implemented	Manual Proc ###	
B14D: Support of ESCO Contest Period Reinstatement Requests via EDI - Drop Code Changes (incl. CHA)	4/7/2015	9/21/2015	Optional - testing date determined by Utility	Optional - implementation date determined by Utility	No	Implemented	See lines six and seven	Implemented	Implemented	No	Implemented	No	
Utility Implementing of CHU Code when customer drops to default service					Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	No	Implemented	No
B14E: Support Service Portability via EDI					No	Implemented	No	No	Yes but AM-EDJ Implementation	No	No	No	
Notes: ### UBR Utilities have the option to employ AMT*7 when the ESCO issuing the GSP credit is no longer serving the customer or in Dual Bill situations (Grid is exercising this option). Otherwise, a UBR Utility may use a cancel/rebill to re-open a billing window when the customer is no longer served by the ESCO issuing the GSP Credit or a non-EDI process for dual bill situations. [NYSEG/RG&E is taking this approach]													
APP Items - Round 2 & Other Changes:													
503: Pricing History Transaction					Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	
Ready to Test - Date Implemented					5/26/2017	N/A	5/26/2017	7/17/2017	N/A	N/A	Testing	N/A	
Interim/Alternative 503 Approach					6/26/2017	N/A	6/26/2017	8/18/2017	N/A	N/A	TBD ***	N/A	
B20: the addition of the new RM007 code of GR			TBD***	TBD***	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Manual	No	
B14C: Addition of rejection reason codes MOV & ECB in REF*7G	7/24/2015	12/7/2015	Optional - testing date determined by Utility	Optional - implementation date determined by Utility	No	No	Not Implemented	KEDNY Implemented/ KEDNY Not Implemented	No	No	No	No	
B14C/B14E: Support exchange of Customer email addresses and facsimile numbers with ESCOs via EDI					No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
B14E: Support PER Administrative Communications Contact (Customer Phone Number) Segment to N1*BT loop via EDI					No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Notes: *** Implementation dates will be set prospectively now that Prohibition Order was implemented.													
EDJ Standards Changes filed 11/30/2018:													
Migration to G15B EDM 1.6	n/a	n/a	Optional	Optional	Implemented	Large Customers mostly on 1.6/Small mostly on 1.4/target year end 2021	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	
Migration to 1024-bit PGP encryption keys					Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	No	Implemented	
TLS 1.0 Upgrade to TLS 1.2 or 1.3 for NAESB EDM EDI Exchanges													
What TLS versions do you support in production EDI data exchange with EDI trading partners, including ESCOs?					1.0	1.0, 1.1 and 1.2	Supports all	Supports all	Supports all	Supports all	Yes, 1.0, 1.1 and 1.2	Supports all	Supports all
Do you have a plan to replace TLS 1.0 with implementation of TLS 1.2 or 1.3 in production with ESCOs, and if so when?	n/a	n/a	Optional	Optional	No	No	No	Inbound: Once WAF protection implemented, we'll only accept TLS 1.2 and TLS 1.3 Outbound: No plans	No	New trading partners require TLS 1.2 but no mandate for existing	No	New trading partners require TLS 1.2 and TLS 1.3 but no mandate for existing	Inbound: Once WAF protection implemented, we'll only accept TLS 1.2 and TLS 1.3 Outbound: No plans
If you don't currently have a plan to implement TLS 1.2 or 1.3, do you require a PSC order to do so?					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Interval Usage for EDI													
Historical Interval Usage via EDI					No plans to implement	Currently in production	No plans to implement	N/A	N/A	No plans to implement	24	No plans to implement	
Number of months of summary HU sent in EDI - Gas			n/a		24	12	12	12	24	12	24	12	
Number of months of summary HU available on portal - Gas					24	24	12	N/A	24	12	n/a	24	
Number of months of summary HU sent in EDI - Electric					24	24	12	N/A	n/a	12	24	12	
Number of months of summary HU available on portal - Electric					24	24	12+1/26	N/A	n/a	24	n/a	24	
New York Customer Account Block Info													
B14 Enrollment Response													
Is CAB-Customer Account Blocked- used to reject an enrollment where a Customer Account Block is in place?					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
If CAB is sent in REF02, is additional text info sent in the REF03 to aid in resolving the rejected transaction?					Code goes in REF3 segment along with description text indicating that Customer account is blocked	7001020 Blocked Enrollment	No	KEDNY: CAB - CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED CAB - SWITCH NOT AUTHORIZED BY CUST KEDU: CAB - CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED Message: Utility Customer Account Number xxxxxxxx RESTRICTED PER CUSTOMER REQUEST			Yes	No	
Does the utility employ a Single block or Dual Block (both Enrollment and HU requests)?					Single (Enrollment)	Dual	Single (Enrollment only)	Single	Dual	*see foot notes	Single REF="02" CAB="01020 Blocked Enrollment"	*see foot notes	
B14 Consumption History Response													
Is CAB-Customer Account Blocked- used to reject a Historical Usage request where a Customer Account Block is in place?					No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	It depends	Yes	It depends	
If CAB is sent in REF02, is additional text info sent in the REF03 to aid in resolving the rejected transaction?					na	CAB - CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED.	NA	KEDNY: CAB - CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED CAB - NY CANNOT RELEASE USAGE KEDU: CAB - CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED Requested Block Message: Customer Account Blocked	No		Yes	No	
Does the utility employ a Single block or Dual Block (both Enrollment and HU requests)?					Single (Enrollment)	Dual	Single (Enrollment only)	Single	Dual	*see footnotes	Single	*see footnotes	

***NYSEG-RG&E Footnotes**

If the question is referring to an B14 enrollment with a secondary loop request for Historical usage then Yes, we will reject both the enrollment and the secondary request for HU if there is a RA enrollment block on the contract account.

If the question is referring to a stand alone B14 Historical usage request then the answer is No.

If the account has a Historical Usage block on the installation (regardless of whether or not there is an RA enrollment block on the contract account), then the B14 HU request will be rejected.

If the account has only an RA enrollment block on the contract account, and no Historical usage block on the installation then we will reject the request.

Please also note that even if there is no RA enrollment block on the contract account but the contract account is enrolled in either LIRR or LIAP (Low Income) then B14 enrollments as well as B14 enrollments w/ secondary loop requests for Historical usage will reject for reason CAB.

The only exceptions to this rejection rule are CCA ESCOs or ESCOs with waivers that get added to table ZU_ENROL_WAIVER manually by supplier relations.

The majority of accounts only block on enrollments.

***NFG Footnote**
CAB is only used for a low-income block; Customer Requested blocks use a response of ANE