

**Case 12-M-0476, et. al.**  
**EDI Business Working Group (BWG)**  
**Final Minutes – June 6, 2014**

**Administration**

- Review/Modify Agenda: The Draft Agenda was adopted unmodified.
- Review of Draft Minutes: Minutes from the May 30, 2014 BWG meeting were reviewed and adopted as final with no changes.
- National Grid had a question regarding the language in the Commission Order about the NYPA/Utility Discounts. The 2/25/2014 Order talks about customers who are “first through the meter.” This will not be addressed in the EDI transaction. The ESCOs would contact the utilities after they see the indicator to get further details about customer discounts.

**Business Working Group (BWG) Discussion on Implementation Guide Language**

**1) NYPA/ReChargeNY Indicator**

- The draft language from O&R, which was included in the 5/30/2014 minutes, was accepted by the BWG and passed to the Technical Working Group (TWG).
- The BWG reviewed the ReChargeNY monthly enrollment workpaper that was provided by Rich Spilky. NYPA appears to be the ultimate source of the information.
- Based upon an informal poll of the utilities, it was determined that the total number of ReChargeNY accounts across the state is no more than 500.
  - The ReChargeNY spreadsheet provides more information than the proposed EDI ReChargeNY indicator would provide and may be a more efficient way to inform ESCOs which customers are active in ReChargeNY.
  - More investigation is needed concerning the ReChargeNY spreadsheet; it may still be necessary to include the ReChargeNY indicator with the historic usage file. The ESCOs can use the spreadsheet to get additional information.
- The BWG said it would be helpful if the Department of Public Service could post a similar spreadsheet on its web site each month which could serve as a comprehensive list, organized by utility, of every customer enrolled in ReChargeNY. The current ReChargeNY spreadsheet includes just the customers enrolled in that particular month. Patrice O’Connor will ask LuAnn Scherer to verify the source of the ReChargeNY spreadsheet and whether it is possible to post it on the DPS web site each month in a modified form.

**Business Discussion**

**1) Reject Reason Codes (continued)**

- The Customer Account Block is already provided in EDI as an Enrollment Response so BWG/TWG will document in its filing to the Commission.

**2) Low Income Program/HEAP Customer Indicator**

- The discussion of low income issues is hypothetical because of the Commission Stay.
- The low income status indicator should be in the 867 HU. To the extent a block was in place, there would be no response other than a reject.

- In response, the ESCO could contact the customer to remove the block, at which point an 867 HU could be provided.
- For utilities that support both enrollment and historic usage blocks, to the extent only the latter was in place, it is possible for the ESCO to enroll the customer without having the historic usage block removed. In this case, the ESCO would learn of the customer's low income status in an 814 transaction.
- Provided the block has been removed (or if there were no block in place initially), in the event there was no usage (e.g. a new account), non-usage information in the 867 HU would be sent without usage.
- Additionally, low income status could be provided on the 814 enrollment response and changes in low income status would be communicated via 814 change transactions. This would be a "Yes/No" response.

### **3) Utility Full Service Billing Amount History**

- The ESCO who is serving the low income customer would send a request to the utility to initiate this transaction. This wouldn't necessarily need to be done via EDI and as an alternative could be done via email or phone. This could be explained in each utilities specific implementation guide notes.
- A workpaper was sent out to the BWG from National Grid regarding an optional 503 EDI transaction.
  - There was no objection in BWG to pursuing the 503 transaction for addressing full service billing amount history.
  - National Grid and PPL could flesh this transaction out but need a list of fields to be communicated. Fields could include: month, total amount, delivery charges, and supply portion.
  - There was additional discussion regarding communication of the utility full service amount on a monthly basis.
- National Grid clarified that what was intended in the work paper was to move all new EDI requirements which have been developed so far in response to the Commission Order, from the 867 HU into the 503. After some discussion among the other utilities in BWG, it was determined that the other new transactions in the 867 but would agree to use the 503 for billing history.

### **4) ESCO Bill Credit Transactions**

- At the 5/30/2014 BWG meeting, discussion on possible use of the 812 transaction for bill credits took place. Further discussion during this meeting indicated problems with this approach, most notably a delay to the next billing cycle (see Attachment).
- Use of bill ready credit transaction (810BR) by rate ready systems was discussed as an alternative to the 812.
- Another option considered is whether to have the utility calculate the credit since in its role as bill provider, it would have the necessary information available within its system.
- At the 6/13/2014 BWG meeting, utilities should be able to comment on their preferred approach.

### **4) Utility Maintained Implementation Guides/Documents**

- Mike Novak will put together a work paper for the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting to initiate discussion.
  - BWG participants were encouraged to email any ideas concerning what should be in the guides to him.

- The BWG will need to discuss timing and how much advance notice to ESCOs should be provided when there are updates to utility maintained implementation guides.

**Technical Working Group (TWG) Discussion - Technical work reflecting BWG outcomes**

**Effective dates for the ICAP Tag**

- The TWG Chair asked whether effective dates for the ICAP tag could be added into the 867 transaction. ISTA commented that in Pennsylvania, dates are provided with the tags.
  - Con Ed commented that they don't have future ICAP tags.
  - NYSEG/RG&E said they can provide a date for whatever tag they are providing.

**TS867 Workpaper Draft**

- The TWG Chair a new document would be issued with revisions and it will be circulated to the group to discuss next week.

**Development of initial EDI filing due in late June**

- The EDI filing needs to be locked down next week. Mike Novak will call LuAnn Scherer to give a status of where we are with the changes developed to date, and what could be in the filing.
  - While the 2/25/2014 Order sets a deadline for a filing but it may not be practical to file because some issues have been stayed.

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on 6/13/14 at 10 AM and will be a Business Working Group and/or Technical Working Group.

**Attendees:**

Diane Beard—National Grid	Jeff Begley—Fluent Energy
Christine Hughey--Constellation	Tom Dougherty--ISTA
Vicky Gilmore—Energy Services Group	Giovanni Formato—Con Edison
Jason Gullo—National Fuel Resources	Gary Lawrence—Energy Services Group
Mary Do—Latitude Technologies	Donna Satcher-Jackson—National Grid
Jennifer Lorenzini—Central Hudson	Janet Manfredi—Central Hudson
Veronica Munoz--Accenture	Mike Novak—National Fuel Gas
Jean Pauyo—Orange & Rockland	Debbie Rabago—Ambit Energy
Marie Vajda—NYSEG/RG&E	Sergio Smilley—National Grid
Mary Ann Allen--Integrys	Jay Sauta—Agway Energy Services
Rich Spilky—Integrys Energy	Charlie Trick—NYSEG/RG&E
Jim Stauble--Accenture	Kim Wall—PPL Solutions
Carol Teixeira—National Grid	Rick Tra—National Grid
Patrice O'Connor—DPS Staff	Cindy Tomeny—National Grid
Kusuma Yerramsetti—National Grid	

## Case 12-M-0476 NY EDI X12 Ver/Rel 4010 Transaction Set Alternative 812 Analysis

The purpose of this document is to provide a review of the benefits and drawbacks with the new EDI X12 Ver/Rel 4010 812 transaction set. The 812 will be sent from the ESCO to the LDC in this analysis.

Description of the 812 transaction taken from the EDI X12 Ver/Rel 4010:

This Draft Standard for Trial Use contains the format and establishes the data contents of the Credit/Debit Adjustment Transaction Set (812) for use within the context of an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) environment. The transaction set can be used to notify a trading partner of an adjustment or billback and may be used to request an adjustment or billback. It identifies and contains the details and amounts covering exceptions, adjustments, credits, or debits for goods or services. This transaction set is multidirectional between trading partners.

Advantages:

- Provides an EDI transaction for the ESCO to submit a credit/debit for an account
- Allows the ESCO to perform calculations and submit the credit/debit

Disadvantage:

- ESCO will be responsible for calculation errors submitted to the LDC
- LDC may have to address calls for calculation errors submitted by LDC
- The credit/debit submitted via the 812 from the ESCO will have to wait for the next billing period before the customer and the ESCO can see it on the next bill
- Add cost and complexity to the LDC's billing system
  - Under the rate ready model, the LDC has the rate and the usage therefore can (with coding changes) automatically calculate rate differences for low income customers. The 812 will duplicate this functionality and require added cost and risk.
  - Under the bill ready model, the ESCO can send the credit/debit adjustments in the 810 invoice for low income customers (when provided required data to calculate the adjustment). The 812 will duplicate this functionality and require added cost and risk.
- Both the ESCO and LDC will incur cost and risk to duplicate functionality which can be handled by the LDC in the rate ready model and the 810 in the bill ready model.