EDI Standards Changes:	Filed	Order Issued	Ordered Testing Completion	Ordered Implemen-tation Date	Central Hudson	Con Edison	Nat. Grid - Upstate	Nat. Grid - Downstate	NFG	NYSEG	O&R	RG&E	PSEG-LI
APP Items - Round 1 & Other Changes:													
810UBR/810URR: the addition of the CRE030 SAC04 Charge Type	4/7/2015	9/21/2015	7/3/2017	approx 1 mo. following Prohibition Order implementation	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	
Utility 814C AMT*7 Implemented					Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented ###	Implemented	Manual Proc ###	Implemented	Manual Proc ###	
814D: Support of ESCO Contest Period Reinstatement Requests via EDI			Optional - testing date determined by Utility	Optional - implement. date determined by Utility	No	Implemented	See lines six and seven	Implemented	Implemented	No	Implemented	No	
Drop Code Changes (incl. CHA)					Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	No	Implemented	No	
Utility Implementation of CHU Code when customer drops to default service					Implemented	Planned 2021	Implemented	Implemented	No	No	Implemented	No	
814E: Support Service Portability via EDI					No	Implemented	No	No	Yes but Alt. EDI 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	7/24/2015	12/7/2015	TBD***	TBD***	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	
Ready to Test - Date					5/26/2017	N/A	5/26/2017	7/17/2017	N/A	N/A	Testing	N/A	
Ready to Implement - Date					6/26/2017	N/A	6/26/2017	8/18/2017	N/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	
Implemented					Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	TBD ***	N/A	
Interim/Alternative 503 Approach					No	No	No	No	Secure Web File	No	Manual	No	
820: the addition of the new RMR07 code of GR					7/26/2017	Impemented	Yes	Yes	7/26/2017	No	Implemented	No	
814C: Addition of rejection reason codes MOV & ECB in REF*7G			Optional - testing date determined by Utility	Optional - implement. date determined by Utility	No	No	**Not Implemented**	**KEDNY Implemented/ KEDLI Not Implemented**	No	No	No	No	
814C/814E: Support exchange of Customer email addresses and facsimile numbers with ESCOs via EDI					No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
814E: 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.												
EDI Standards Changes filed 11/30/2018:													
Migration to GISB 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 ESCO's?	n/a	n/a	Optional	Optional	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 ESCO's, and if so when?					No	No	No	Inbound: Once WAF protection implemented, we'll only accept TLS1.2 and TLS 1.3 Outbound: No plans	No	New trading partners require TLS1.2 but no mandate for existing	No	New trading partners require TLS1.2 but no mandate for existing	Inbound: Once WAF protection implemented, we'll only accept TLS1.2 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	n/a				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					24	12	12	12	24	12	24	12	
Number of months of summary HU available on portal - Gas					24	24	12	N/A	24	24	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+H26	N/A	n/a	24	n/a	24	
New York Customer Account Block Info													
814 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 REF1 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 KEDLI: CAB – CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED CAB - ALL ENROLLMENTS REJECTED PER CUSTOMER REQUEST	Message: Utilty Customer Account Number xxxxxxxxx Restricted from Enrollment	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 foot notes	Single REF*7G*CAB*7001020 Blocked Enrollment**	*see foot notes	
814 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 KEDLI: CAB – CUSTOMER ACCOUNT BLOCKED	Low Income Block Message: Historical Usage Not Released for Utility Account Number Customer 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	
814 Consumption History Response													
Is CAB-Customer Account Blocked- used to reject a Historical Usage request where a Customer Account Block is in place?								yes					

***NYSEG-RGE footnotes**

If the question is referring to an 814 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 814 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 814 HU request

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

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 LIAF (Low income) than 814 enrollments as well as 814 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 ZLI_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