Exhibit No.:	
Issues:	Green Button Connect
Witness:	Katherine Wyszkowski
Sponsoring Party:	Renew Missouri Advocates
Type of Exhibit:	Surrebuttal Testimony
Case No.:	ER-2026-0143
Testimony Filed:	September 10, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILE NO. ER-2026-0143

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF
KATHERINE WYSZKOWSKI
ON BEHALF OF RENEW MISSOURI

September 10th, 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Katherine Wyszkowski. I am the State Policy Manager of Mission:data Coalition ("Mission:data"). My business address is 7511 Greenwood Avenue North #1809, Seattle, WA 98103.

Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS DOCKET?

A. I am testifying on behalf of Renew Missouri Advocates d/b/a Renew Missouri ("Renew Missouri"), an intervenor in this proceeding.

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME KATHERINE WYSZKOWSKI THAT PROVIDED DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. My purpose is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of Evergy Metro witness Katie McDonald and staff witness Shawn E. Lange with regard to Green Button Connect ("GBC"). First, I respond to assumptions Evergy made in their testimony about customer usage, benefits and use cases for all Evergy customers, and decisions regarding barriers that Green Button Download My Data ("GBDMD") presents to customers who may want to participate in aggregation programs in the future. Additionally, I address other Missouri utility customers that have access to GBC. Second, I address staff witness Shawn E. Lange. My testimony responds to concerns regarding the information that GBCMD provides access to, cost estimates, cyber security and our proposed tariff language related to utility liability.

II. RESPONSE TO EVERGY WITNESS KATIE MCDONALD

Q. WHAT DID EVERGY WITNESS MCDONALD STATE REGARDING GBC?

A. Ms. McDonald opposes the requirement for GBC, arguing that since a small percentage of customers have demonstrated interest in downloading their own data, utilization rates of GBC will be similarly small.

Q. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF CUSTOMERS DOWNLOADED THEIR OWN DATA?

A. Ms. McDonald stated that approximately 3% of residential customers in Missouri today have downloaded their data from Evergy's website using GBDMD.[1]

Q. IS IT REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THE GBC UTILIZATION RATE WILL BE SIMILAR TO THE GBDMD UTILIZATION RATE?

A. No. GBDMD and GBC are materially different processes and serve different purposes. As the name suggests, Download My Data requires a customer to login to the utility's website, navigate to the right location, download a file, and then upload that file to another service. Download My Data is a manual process, taking some level of effort for each file that needs to be moved. GBC, however, is automated and ongoing, requiring only a single interaction from a customer: Granting consent. Given that Download My Data requires substantially more customer involvement to initiate the sharing of data, Download My Data has very limited use cases as compared with GBC. In particular, ongoing energy management that requires daily deliveries of interval usage data from smart meters will be particularly onerous for customers with GBDMD.

Q. HAVE OTHER EXPERTS RECOGNIZED THE DIFFERENCE IN USABILITY BETWEEN GBDMD AND GBC?

A. Yes. As early as 2012, the Edison Foundation's Institute for Electricity Efficiency published a report on Green Button, comparing GBDMD and GBC, which stated:

---

[1] *Rebuttal Testimony of Katie R. McDonald,* page 6 at line 6.

Currently, Green Button requires customers to download their energy usage data to a computer and then manually upload it to a third party application. The downloading process is a barrier. As the Green Button movement matures, an automation process, known as "Green Button Connect My Data," where the customer clicks a button to push the data to a third-party, will become the norm.[2]

In addition, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") recently recognized that GBDMD and other manual or tedious data transfer mechanisms can distort wholesale markets by unduly limiting market participation. I discuss FERC's decision in detail below.

Q. DID EVERGY WITNESS MCDONALD PROVIDE THE PERCENTAGE OF NON-RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS THAT HAVE DOWNLOADED THEIR DATA?

A. No, the 3% mentioned above only included residential customers.[3]

Q. WHAT CONCLUSION DID EVERGY DRAW FROM ITS EVALUATION OF GBC?

A. Ms. McDonald stated that GBC could provide value to certain customer segments, particularly larger commercial and industrial ("C&I") customers. However, Ms. McDonald nevertheless opposed GBC on the basis that its costs would be borne by the entire customer base despite C&I customers receiving benefits.[4]

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS CONCLUSION?

---

[2] "Green Button: One Year Later." Issue Brief from Institute for Electricity Efficiency, an Institute of the Edison Foundation. September, 2012 at 7. Available at https://web.archive.org/web/20220512124904/https://www.edisonfoundation.net/-/media/Files/IEI/publications/IEE_Green-Button-Report_Final.pdf

[3] *Rebuttal Testimony of Katie R. McDonald*, page 6 at line 6.

[4] Ibid. at line 9-13

A. No, for several reasons. With GBC, residential customers will be able to access meaningful services that help them manage their electric bills. As I mentioned in my direct testimony, residential customers will be able to access energy management, cost analysis software, automated bill audits that search for overcharges, financial benchmarking services against peers, and even certain financial products that allow customers to borrow money for efficiency improvements.[5] In the future, residential customers will also be able to participate in the wholesale market and earn compensation for their load flexibility. These opportunities will not be limited to C&I customers in the future. Additionally, other use cases, such as ensuring bill accuracy, are equally beneficial to all customer types. Concluding that GBC's benefits are limited to C&I customers is inaccurate.

Q. DID EVERGY WITNESS MCDONALD ADDRESS ANY USE CASES FOR GREEN BUTTON CONNECT?

A. No, she did not.

Q. ARE THERE SPECIFIC USE CASES THAT REQUIRE CONTINUOUS AND AUTOMATED ACCESS TO AUTHORIZED CUSTOMER DATA?

A. Yes, there are several.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE ONE SUCH USE CASES.

A. Aggregation of distributed energy resources ("DERs") and participation in the wholesale market require timely and ongoing access to certain data, such as meter readings.

[5] Direct Testimony Katherine Wyszkowski Page 26 at lines 15-18

Q. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY RECENT DECISIONS DEMONSTRATING THAT GBDMD IS NOT ADEQUATE FOR WHOLESALE MARKET PARTICIPATION BY AGGREGATORS?

A. Yes, a recent order from FERC describes the limitations of GBDMD as unjust and unreasonable. The order highlights the importance of state authority in mandating automated, scalable data sharing systems so that aggregations of DERs can participate in wholesale markets.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE FERC'S DECISION.

A. On July 29, 2026, FERC determined that PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.'s ("PJM") Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT") is unjust and unreasonable because residential smart-meter data is not "reasonably available" to competitive market participants. FERC's key finding is as follows:

> We find that Complainants have provided 'specific, demonstrable evidence' that CSPs [curtailment service providers] cannot reasonably access residential customers' interval meter data with the efficiency and scale needed to effectively participate in the ELRP [emergency load response program].[6]

Q. DID THE EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY THE COMPLAINANTS TO FERC INCLUDE UTILITIES THAT PROVIDE GBDMD?

A. Yes, and GBCMD was specifically mentioned.[7]

Q. DID FERC RECOGNIZE SEVERAL BARRIERS ENCOUNTERED BY THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS IN ACCESSING CUSTOMER DATA FROM ELECTRIC UTILITIES?

---

[6] *Voltus, Inc., and Mission:data v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,* 196 FERC ¶ 61,074 at P 66 (2026).

[7] *See* Schedule KW-S-1, Complaint of Voltus, Inc. and Mission:data Coalition v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (filed Oct 8th, 2025) at 5, 12, 14 from FERC Docket No. EL25-4-000.

A. Yes, FERC acknowledged the following as barriers:

A. Restrictions limiting the provision of interval meter data to licensed suppliers or brokers, thereby excluding third-party curtailment service providers;
B. Access to interval meter data only in impractically small batches;
C. Restrictions on the use of electronic interfaces (Electronic Data Interchange) necessary to conduct efficient business transactions;
D. Inability to access larger numbers of accounts because of irreversible two-factor authentication requirements;
E. Economically prohibitive annual, per-account fees for data procurement; and
F. Impractically slow response times for requests for access to interval meter data.[8]

Taken together, FERC found that these barriers impinged on a curtail service provider's ability to "reasonably access" information.

Q. WHICH OF THE BARRIERS MENTIONED ABOVE PERTAIN TO GBDMD?

A. The second barrier (B), limitation concerning access to interval meter data only in impractically small batches, pertains to GBDMD because receiving individual customer data submissions on a daily basis, one file for each customer, is impractically small. A successful DER aggregator would potentially have thousands or tens of thousands of participating customers.

Q. ARE YOU ASSERTING THAT FERC'S ORDER REQUIRES EVERGY TO IMPLEMENT GBC?

[8] *Voltus, Inc., and Mission:data v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,* 196 FERC ¶ 61,074 at P 67.

A. No. FERC's order addressed the particular provisions of the PJM tariff. I am arguing that the order establishes an important regulatory precedent concerning the reasonable accessibility of customer interval data as it relates to wholesale markets. The Commission should take note of FERC's observations with regard to GBDMD.

Q. FERC'S ORDER SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED THE PJM TARIFF. IS IT APPROPRIATE TO CONSIDER FERC'S FINDING SINCE EVERGY IS A MEMBER OF SOUTHWEST POWER POOL ("SPP")?

A. Although FERC's decision was about specific provisions in the PJM tariff, the underlying issues – i.e., whether customer interval usage data is reasonably accessible to competitive market participants – is analogous and pertinent to SPP. SPP also has metering and data requirements applicable to market participants,[9] and much of the data SPP requires can only come from Evergy, particularly when it comes to small customers. While I am not a lawyer, it is reasonable to consider whether similar data access barriers in Missouri could affect participation in SPP's wholesale market. GBC is directionally aligned with, and a prudent first step for, FERC 2222 compliance.

Q. CAN UTILITIES ADDRESS THE AFOREMENTIONED BARRIERS WHILE ONLY PROVIDING GBDMD?

A. No, expecting to receive data from individual customers each time a service provider requires it is the definition of "impractically small batches" and cannot be reconciled with GBDMD. FERC's decision found that requiring an aggregator to obtain data through thousands of individual, customer-initiated downloads is the type of fragmented and

---

[9] Southwest Power Pool, Inc. Market Protocols SPP Integrated Marketplace (Rev 119) (2026).

impractical process that, when required by the tariffs of a Regional Transmission Organization such as SPP, constitutes a violation of the Federal Power Act.

Q. DOES EVERGY HAVE AN INCENTIVE TO DEPRIVE AGGREGATORS OF ACCESS TO CUSTOMER DATA, EVEN WITH CUSTOMER PERMISSION?

A. Yes. The Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act ("MEEIA") allows Evergy to charge ratepayers for the costs of administering demand response programs.[10] Driving out aggregations of retail customers ("ARCs") helps Evergy maximize revenue and profits associated with capital assets necessary to meet peak demand.

Q. WHAT ARE SOME NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF EVERGY DEPRIVING AGGREGATORS OF ACCESS TO CUSTOMER DATA, EVEN WITH CUSTOMER PERMISSION?

A. The impacts are twofold: First, regarding MEEIA demand response programs, ratepayers could be overpaying for demand response costs in rates because Evergy could be paying supra-competitive rebates to customers to induce participation. Competitive market participants may be able to achieve effective demand response at a lower total cost than Evergy, yet they are prevented from meaningful participation, particularly with small business and residential customers. Second, ratepayers are paying higher energy costs since demand response resources – particularly from small customers – have very limited participation ability at SPP. A lower supply of demand response would tend to increase wholesale prices.

[10] RSMo § 393.1075.

Q. ARE YOU ARGUING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF MEEIA DEMAND RESPONSE PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY EVERGY?

A. No, we are supportive of demand response programs that lower costs for customers. GBC is a vital tool for ensuring effective and competitive demand response. It ensures Evergy's own MEEIA demand response programs remain competitive and provide benefits to all customers and allows third party providers to *effectively* participate in resource aggregation, both of which tend to reduce total costs paid by all customers.

Q. HOW IS EVERGY'S TESTIMONY INCORRECT ABOUT THE ADEQUACY OF GBDMD?

A. The testimony provided Ms. McDonald establishes merely that a customer has the ability to download their data and share it with another party. That is true, but while GBDMD may be helpful in certain situations, Ms. McDonald does not account for use cases that require continuous, automated access to data at scale.

Q. IT IS REASONABLE TO REQUIRE A CUSTOMER TO DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THEIR DATA EVERY TIME AN AGGREGATOR NEEDS IT FOR SPP REPORTING PURPOSES?

A. No. It is extremely unlikely that Evergy customers will repeatedly go through the steps of downloading and sharing their data each time an aggregator requires it. Importantly, an aggregator may require access to that data on a daily basis. Requiring customers to download and share the correct data every day is unjust and unreasonable. Moreover, even if customers were not interested in earning wholesale market revenues, there are numerous use cases that require daily access to customer data. For example, helping customers mitigate their peak demand or monitoring the effectiveness of an energy efficiency retrofit requires ongoing data access.

III. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS SHAWN E. LANGE

Q. WHAT DID MR. LANGE STATE REGARDING GREEN BUTTON?

A. Staff opposes the implementation of GBC at this time. While Staff agrees there are significant customer benefits that could be realized through GBC, Staff listed concerns with the implementation, cost, cyber security, and proposed tariff.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. LANGE'S DESCRIPTION OF GBC AS A SYSTEM THAT "ALLOWS THE CUSTOMER OR THEIR AGENT TO DIRECTLY CONNECT TO A UTILITY'S BILLING SYSTEM FOR NEAR REAL-TIME DATA THAT IS EASIER FOR ENERGY MANAGERS TO ACCESS AND TRACK"?[11]

A. That description is not technically accurate. GBC does not provide a "direct connection" to a utility bill system. Rather, it provides authorized third parties with access to read-only data through an Application Programming Interface ("API"). It is customary and expected that utilities implementing GBC will erect numerous barriers and safeguards around their billing systems, including, but not limited to, network segmentation and limiting permissions. Although GBC ultimately delivers some billing-related information, a permission-based structure through an API is materially different from unfettered access.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. LANGE'S CONCERN THAT, ALTHOUGH THE COST OF OBTAINING GBC CERTIFICATION IS LOW, IMPLEMENTATION OF

[11] *Rebuttal Testimony of Shawn E. Lange*, page 5 at line 15-16.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE NECESSARY TO OBTAIN THAT CERTIFICATION COULD BE COSTLY AND TECHNICALLY DIFFICULT?[12]

A. I agree that implementation costs will not be zero, and they should be carefully evaluated. My cost estimates were based on public information from other utilities, and if Evergy's costs were to differ from my estimate, then Evergy would need to demonstrate to the Commission that such variances were prudent. Ultimately, Evergy witness Ms. McDonald provided cost information in testimony, which is more precise because it is specific to Evergy's systems.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. LANGE'S INITIAL CYBERSECURITY CONCERN REGARDING APIs?[13]

A. To my knowledge, there has not been a reported cybersecurity incident related to GBC anywhere in the country. I agree that cybersecurity is important, and Mission:data has supported the efforts of many utilities across the country to deploy GBC in a way that protects utilities' underlying systems. Since GBC has been in operation for many years without incident is evidence that cybersecurity concerns have been successfully addressed.

Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THE STATEMENT THAT "CARE DOES NEED TO BE TAKEN TO MINIMIZE POTENTIAL SECURITY CONCERNS."[14]

A. I agree with this statement. Utility vendors that provide GBC should be properly vetted and should provide assurances of their cybersecurity practices and the measures they employ to minimize vulnerabilities. I would expect that every information technology purchase by Evergy

[12] Id. page 6 at line 9-12.
[13] Id. page 6 at line 15-18.
[14] Id. page 7 at line 1.

goes through a rigorous evaluation process regarding system design, network architecture and risk assessment. My point is that numerous other utilities nationwide have completed such an assessment, they have deployed GBC for millions of consumers over many years, and no such cybersecurity incidents have ever occurred to my knowledge.

Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO MR. LANGE'S CONCERN THAT "THERE ARE FEW GUARDRAILS ON WHAT THIRD-PARTY ENERGY MANAGERS CAN DO WITH CUSTOMER DATA AFTER THE CUSTOMER HAS AUTHORIZED THE THIRD-PARTY TO OBTAIN IT?"[15]

A. Third-party service providers must adhere to state and federal requirements related to customer security, privacy, and breach notification. I have recommended supplementing these measures by requiring data recipients to agree to the DataGuard privacy standard in the Green Button tariff, which gives additional power to state or federal enforcers of laws concerning deceptive business practices. Additionally, I am not aware of a single reported incident of a third party misusing customer data for unauthorized or nefarious purposes.

Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THE COST ESTIMATE CONCERN?

A. Under confidentiality, Evergy provided a cost estimate they received for a GBC system in their reply testimony. That information provides a more direct basis for evaluating the potential cost implications than estimates derived from publicly available information.

Q. MR.LANGE STATED THAT OTHER UTILITIES IN MISSOURI PROVIDE GBC.[16] DO YOU THINK IT IS FAIR FOR CUSTOMERS IN AMEREN TERRITORY TO HAVE ACCESS TO DATA BUT NOT EVERGY CUSTOMERS?

---

[15] Id. at line 1-4.
[16] Id. at line 7-8.

A. No. It would be unfair for some customers in Missouri to have the benefits of portable data while others do not, as well as clear inconsistency in statewide policy between utilities that already can format and provide Green Button data.

Q. WHAT WAS ANOTHER CONCERN OF MR. LANGE'S?

A. Staff was concerned that the Green Button tariff "mandates the offering of GBC data without the infrastructure needed for EMM to comply."

Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THE CONCERN "SUGGESTING A TARIFF THAT MANDATES THE OFFERING OF GBC DATA WITHOUT THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDED FOR EMM TO COMPLY."[17]

A. GBC has been considered in two other Missouri utilities: Ameren Missouri and Liberty. Ameren was mandated to adopt GBC as a benefit for all customers.[18] Liberty was not required to adopt GBC, because its billing system was experiencing significant issues, delays, inaccuracies, such that GBC adoption was not ripe.[19]

I am not aware of any public information that Evergy's infrastructure is experiencing comparable deficiencies. Evergy may have to move and reformat data for an API to work, but there is no publicly shared technical limitation analogous to Liberty that would prevent Evergy from providing timely and accurate information. Evergy already provides GBDMD, demonstrating that the relevant data is already being maintained and formatted to fit the standard.

---

[17] Id. at line 17-18.

[18] *Order Approving Stipulations and Agreements* In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Adjust its Revenues for Electric Service, Case No. ER-2024-0319.

[19] *Report and Order,* In the Matter of the Request of the Empire District Electric Company d/b/a Liberty for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in Its Missouri Service Area Case No. ER-2024-0261.

Q. WHAT IS STAFF'S CONCERN REGARDING THE TERMINATION PROVISION IN THE TARIFF?

A. Mr. Lange's concern is that potential cyber security and customer privacy risks may be left unaddressed until the Commission has time for a full investigation and hearing. Additionally, it leaves the Commission in a position of regulating third parties outside its jurisdiction.[20]

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE??

A. The reason we do not recommend that the utility assume responsibility for policing third parties is because it can expose the utility to liability concerns and conflicts of interest. Customers will always retain the ability to revoke their authorization. Additionally, the service providers that use GBC can directly compete with utilities by providing energy efficiency offerings or in the wholesale market.

Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

---

[20] *Rebuttal Testimony of Shawn E. Lange,* page 8 at line 12-16.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Request of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Electric Service	))))	**File No. ER-2026-0143**

AFFIDAVIT OF KATHERINE WYSZKOWSKI

STATE OF COLORADO	)	
	)	**ss**
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON	)	

COMES NOW Katherine Wyszkowski and on her oath states that she is of lawful age; that she prepared the attached Surrebuttal Testimony; and that the same is true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Katherine Wyszkowski

Subscribed and sworn before me this 9 day of September, 2026.

Notary Public

My Commission expires: May 25, 2029

IAN CHRISTOPHER MOREY
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID 20174022271
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MAY 25, 2029