Case No. 12-M-0476 et al. EDI Business/Technical Working Groups Proposed Change Control Process 11/4/2016

I. Proposed change request form:

New York EDI Change Request							
Requester's Name: Kris Redanauer		LDC/ESCO Name: Direct Energy	Phone # :				
Date of Request: 10/17/16		Affected EDI Transaction Set #(s): 814D	E-Mail Address:				
Requested Implementation Date:		0140	Status:				
water services from contract. Every violation for example - if a result have no way of know the early termination. Detail Explanation This change established	gned legislation that imposing a terminal ation would be pun lative contacts us the decay fee we could be in a (Exactly what chartes a uniform standard).	at prohibits providers of telephone, cellular ation or early cancellation fee if a custome ishable by a civil penalty of \$1000. The boo cancel we can certainly waive the fee. It eased customer and would therefore only a violation. Perhaps an EDI code would define is required? To which Implementation Guid for reporting an account closing due to a defic) so that the ESCO will know that any early the strength of t	r has deceased before the end of such ill took effect on September 27. If they however contact the utility, we receive a drop transaction. If we then bill o the trick? des? Why?): ath. We would like to have new reason code				
Cost Justification	Should be complete By adding new cod	ed by initiating party. Will be added to by othe e in an existing segment, we will be cutting do					
Implementation Cost	involved. Will be completed (high level estimate only) if it is agreed Change Control is worth pursuing.						
Incremental Ongoing Costs	Will be completed (high level estimate only) if it is agreed Change Control is worth pursuing.						
	Fo	r Change Control Manager Use (Only:				
Date of NY Discussion:		Expected Implementation Date:					
NY Discussion	and Resolutior	1:	·				

Case No. 12-M-0476 et al. EDI Business/Technical Working Groups Proposed Change Control Process 11/4/2016

II. Proposed web page to track processing of NY EDI Change Requests (illustrative example from NAESB web site shown below; table columns would be set to categories that were consistent with the NY EDI Working Group process):

Request #	Quad	Description	Requester	Information On Request	Recommendation	Comments On Recommendation	EC Status	Ratification	Final Action
<u>R16014</u>	WGQ	Request for an enhancement to NAESB WGQ Standard 4.3.80 to increase the allowable field length in ASCII Comma Separated Value (CSV) files.	Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC and FIS Energy Services						
<u>R16013</u>	WGQ	Request to allow checkboxes and radio buttons to indicate "Yes" and/or "No" responses to Data Elements on Transportation Service Provider's (TSP's) Electronic Bulletin Boards (EBBs).	Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC and Boardwalk Pipeline Partners, LP						
R16012	WGQ	Request to add three Business Conditional Data Elements to the Authorization to Post Imbalances dataset in NAESB WGQ Standard No. 2.4.9. Addition of these data elements will allow service requesters to authorize specific contracts and quantities for specified periods of time.	Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC						
Attachment 1 - Proposed Framework Attachment 2 - Rationale and Further considerations Attachment 3 - KBH Center Paper on LAUF	WGQ	A proposal to develop a uniform and transparent industry-wide standard for calculating LAUF for use by any entity providing natural gas delivery service that is required to report LAUF ("LAUF reporting entity" or "LRE"), including without limitation, (1) interstate pipelines, (2) storage operators, (3) intrastate pipelines, and (4) local distribution companies ("LDCs")	Environmental Defense Fund, Citizens Utility Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, Massachusetts Attorney General's Office and California Public Utilities Commission						
Attachment 4 - ICF report on LAUF									