

Case No. 12-M-0476 et al.
EDI Business/Technical Working Groups Draft Minutes September 27, 2019

1) **Welcome**

- a. Attendance
- b. Review/Modify Agenda- accepted
- c. DPS Staff Remarks – no remarks

2) **NY EDI Working Group**

- a. Volunteers for Chair/Co-Chair
 - Kim Wall maintain her position as technical contact
 - Need Volunteer
- b. Volunteer to prepare and file EDI Reports
 - Need volunteer

3) **Market Changes Implementation Workpaper**

- Cent Hud- no changes
- Con Ed- no changes
- Nat Grid- no changes
- Nat Fuel- no changes
- NYSEG RGE- no changes
- O&R- no changes

4) **Status of Conversion to GISB/NAESB EDM Version 1.6**

- Cent Hud- anticipate completion by end of 2019
- Con Ed- anticipate start in 10-13 weeks from 9/27
- Nat Grid- Implemented
- Nat Fuel- Implemented
- NYSEG RGE- anticipate completion by end of 2019
- O&R- NAESB 1.6 in progress

5) **PSEG-LI Participation in NY EDI Work Group**

- Difficult to reach supplier coordination team. Are they a part of NY EDI Standards?
- Tom Dougherty- Acknowledges they are difficult to contact and states it would be helpful to have them involved.
- DPS Staff volunteers to email PSEG to determine their level of involvement

6) **Net Metering**

- a. Are there any regulations related to net metering that would require a supplier to know that a customer has on-site generation?

-NYSEG RGE- ESCO might not want to be involved with customers with net metering.

-Proposition of sub-group for net metering in EDI. There is interest across utilities/ESCOs/DERs.

- b. How does each utility handle customers that have on-site generation and in any one or more periods the customer generates more than they consume?

-DER can be reported via EDI across utilities. Meter reads for consumption and generation is problematic for transition.

- c. How does each utility identify the generation on the 867 monthly usage transaction?

- Net metering is not currently being reported in the 867 Usage, each utility sends the net consumption or 0 if the customer generates more than they use.

7) **Community Distributed Generation**

- a. Supplier Consolidated Billing

-DERs requesting usage history and that's it.

- b. Impact to ESCOs

-customer's consumption is between DER provider and their utility.

-Limited impact to ESCOs.

8) **Other Business**

-Matt Sigg Constellation- Cyber Security, Director Ops @ Constellation – resistance to upgrading encryption software. TLS 1.2 or 1.3 is the desired software.

-Next steps for continued data security should be discussed going forward.

-Each utility to report back which TLS software they can upgrade to at next meeting.

Subsequent to the meeting, Matt Sigg provided the following for utilities to evaluate prior to the next meeting.

Questions for the NY EDCs with regard to encryption software TLS 1.0 and plans for upgrade

1) Do you currently use TLS 1.0 in production EDI data exchange with EDI trading partners, including ESCO's?

2) 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?

3) 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?

TLS 1.0

So, why should we stop supporting TLS 1.0?

This early version of TLS has been found insecure and has multiple drawbacks. What exactly is wrong then? And why do companies around the world want to drop support rather sooner than later? Here are a few of our reasons:

TLS1.0 is currently being used. Among other reasons, TLS 1.0 is vulnerable to man-in-the-middle attacks, risking the integrity and authentication of data sent between a website and a browser.

Understanding Deprecation of TLS 1.0 and 1.1

TLS 1.0 and 1.1 have been and continue to be vulnerable to cyber attacks. TLS 1.0 was first published in 1999 as RFC 2246, while TLS 1.1 was published in 2006 as RFC 4346.

These previous versions are no longer considered safe for data transmission compared to the encryption security provided by TLS 1.3 and even TLS 1.2.

-Mike Day IGS- DPS order stating if ETF not being charged in event of customer death. Discussion needed as to how to transmit the code indicating the situation. Reason for change code to be added. Consumer getting dropped b/c they die isn't explicitly known. Only way for utilities/ESCOs to know is if they are notified and if a code is provided. We could consider adding a code NTF - No Termination Fee allowed, but we would need to determine if any utility would have a trigger in their system to send that code at the time that the account is being closed and the drop sent to the supplier.

9) Establish Date/Time for Next Meeting

Business Working Group and/or Technical Working Group – 10/25 @ 10am

10) Adjourn

@10:50 a.m.

Attendees

David Tidman – Constellation	Gregg Accardo – National Grid
Stephen Wilson – Vistra Energy	Matt Sigg - Constellation
Amy Delooza – Agway Energy	Christine Hughey – Big Data Energy Services
Kris Redanauer – Direct Energy	Liz Ciborowski – NYSEG/RGE
Frank Nunes - EC Infosystems	Jen Lorrenzini – Cent Hudson
Mario Vega – Just Energy	Mike Day - IGS
Samantha Curry – Starion Energy	Angela Schorr – Direct Energy
Tom Rankin – Marketwise	Janet Manfredi – Central Hudson
Jim Wade – Customized Energy	Deidre Davis - Constellation
Ophelia Heard – NG resources	Aileen Currier – EC Infosystems
Kim Wall - Hansen Technologies	Nicole Barker – National Fuel
Jess Cromeek – Clean Choice Energy	Tom Dougherty - Marketwise
Julie Goodchild – Direct Energy	Gary Lawrence - ESG
Mary Do - Znalytics	Michael Krupp - Constellation
Eric Heaton – Con ED	Pete Foster – NYSEG RGE
Charles Adzema - Customized Energy	Chad Griffin – New Wave Energy