TO:        NAESB REQ and RGQ Members and Interested Industry Participants 
FROM:     Todd Oncken, Deputy Director  
RE:        Retail Gas and Retail Electric Quadrants Request For Comments  
DATE:      April 2, 2004  

An industry comment period begins today and ends on May 3, 2004 for the two recommendations attached. The two recommendations contain identical model business practices. The RGQ Executive Committee and the REQ Executive Committee will follow separate processes to consider and adopt these model business practices. As such, when you prepare your comments, please indicate whether those comments apply to “Retail Gas”, “Retail Electric” or “Both”. The REQ and RGQ Executive Committees will meet in Florida on May 5 to review the model business practices and the comments that are directed toward their quadrants. The recommendations can also be accessed from the NAESB web site (http://www.naesb.org/request.asp). All comments received by the NAESB office by end of business on May 3 will be posted on the NAESB web site and forwarded to the RGQ and REQ EC members for their consideration. If you have difficulty retrieving this document, please call the NAESB office at (713) 356-0060.

Best Regards,

Todd Oncken

cc:  Rae McQuade, Executive Director
1. Recommended Action: Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:

- Accept as requested
- Accept as modified below
- Change to Existing Practice
- Status Quo
- Decline

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

Per Request: Per Recommendation:

- Initiation
- Modification
- Interpretation
- Withdrawal
- Principle
- Definition
- Model Business Practice
- Model Business Practice
- Document
- Data Element
- Code Value
- X12 Implementation Guide
- X12 Implementation Guide
- Business Process Documentation
- Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY:

Add proposed NAESB REQ Model Business Practices (Models) to the existing REQ Model Business Practices on Creditworthiness:

Process flow diagrams to be added as Models within the existing MBP’s:
1) Determination of Initial Credit Limits – Process Flow as MBP 1.3.3.1
2) Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit – Process Flow as MBP 1.4.3.1
3) Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit – Challenge Process Flow as MBP 1.4.3.2
4) Disqualification/Remedies = Process Flow as MBP 1.5.3.1.
Proposed Model Business Practices:

Model Business Practice 1.3.3.1

Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Process Flow

Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.3.3.1)

Applicant

Contacts Creditor to Apply

Fills Out Credit Application Form & Supporting Documents

Submits Credit Application Form to Creditor

(Applicant or Guarantor) Gathers Needed Financial Information

Sends Credit Application Form to Creditor

Receives Credit Application Form from Applicant (Clock Starts/Restarts) (MBP 1.3.1.7)

Checks Credit Application Form for Completeness

If Credit Application Form is not complete, Creditor must notify the Applicant of missing items within 5 business days (MBP 1.3.1.8)

(Able to Complete? Yes, Initial Credit Limit Determination Completed

No, (Clock Stops) Performs Initial Credit Limit Determination (Within 10 Business Days) (MBP 1.3.1.12)

Prepares and Sends Written Report of Initial Credit Limit Determination via Overnight/ Fax/E-mail (Within 5 Business Days of Determination) (MBP 1.3.1.13)

Provides Requested Information

Request Needed Clarification

No

Able to Complete? Yes

Initial Credit Limit Determination Completed

Receives Written Results

Evaluation Complete

Creditor

Sends Request for Missing Data/ Documents via Overnight Fax/E-mail

No (Clock Stops) Complete?

Yes

Checks Credit Application Form for Completeness

Prepares and Sends Written Report of Initial Credit Limit Determination via Overnight/ Fax/E-mail (Within 5 Business Days of Determination) (MBP 1.3.1.13)

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx (Version Approved by SUIS 3/18/2004)
Model Business Practice 1.4.3.1

Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Process Flow
Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.4.3.1)

Applicant

1. Request Reconsideration by Creditor

2. Receives Reconsideration Request

   - Rec’d <=30 Days of Determination?
     - Yes: Go to Challenge Process Flow Diagram
     - No: Material Change?
       - Yes: Send Notice Denying Reconsideration Request
       - No: Time for Periodic Review or Aware of Material Change?
         - Yes: Send Credit Application Form to Applicant
         - No: STOP

3. Fills out Credit Application Form & Supporting Documents

4. Submits Credit Application Form to Creditor

5. Performs Credit Limit Determination

6. Receives Written Results

7. Receives Notice Denying Reconsideration

8. Process Complete

Creditor

1. Initiate Reconsideration

2. Material Change?
   - Yes: Rec’d <=30 Days of Determination?
     - Yes: Send Credit Application Form to Applicant
     - No: STOP
   - No: Time for Periodic Review or Aware of Material Change?
     - Yes: Send Credit Application Form to Applicant
     - No: STOP

3. Send Credit Application Form to Applicant

4. Gathers Needed Financial Information

5. Perform Credit Limit Determination

6. Receives Written Results

7. Receives Notice Denying Reconsideration

8. Process Complete

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/16/2004)
Model Business Practice 1.4.3.2

Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Challenge Process Flow

Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.4.3.2)

Applicant

- Receives and Reviews Written Credit Limit Determination Result
  - Is Determination Acceptable?
    - Yes: Evaluation Complete
    - No: Prepare and Submit Challenge (Within 30 Days) (MBP 1.4.1.1)

Creditor

- Receives Applicant's Challenge
  - Received <= 30 Days?
    - Yes: Send Written Report of Result
    - No: Performs Rationale for Applicant Review (Within 5 Business Days) (MBP 1.4.1.2)

- Receives Written Credit Limit Determination Result
  - Is Determination Acceptable?
    - Yes: Receives and Reviews New Written Result
    - No: Sends Notice Denying Challenge

- Material Errors?
  - Yes: Receives and Reviews New Written Result
  - No: Performs Rationale for Applicant Review (Within 5 Business Days) (MBP 1.4.1.2)

- Perform Credit Limit Reevaluation (Within 10 Business Days of Receipt of Corrected Information) (MBP 1.4.1.2)

- Prepare and Send Written Report of Result (Within 5 Business Days)

- Maximum Duration = 15 Business Days (MBP 1.4.1.2)

- Appeal to Applicable Regulatory Authority
  - Yes: Is Creditor Regulated?
    - Yes: Receives Notice Denying Challenge
    - No: Provides Rationale for Applicant Review (Within 5 Business Days) (MBP 1.4.1.2)

- Is Creditor Regulated?
  - Yes: Receives Notice Denying Challenge
  - No: Receives Notice Denying Challenge

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/18/2004)
Model Business Practice 1.5.3.1

Disqualification/Remedies - Process Flow

Disqualification/Remedies (Section 1.5.3.1)

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/18/2004)
4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

2003-2003 Annual Plan Item 2 - Develop practices for extending commercial credit by Distributors to Supplier to cover financial risk. These models complete the work on Creditworthiness.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee

The proposed Model Business Practices are the result of a series of meetings and conference calls held by the Retail Electric Quadrant’s Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee begun in the Fall of 2002, resulting in approval of Model Business practices on an August 11, 2003 Conference Call, approval of introductory sections on January 13, 2004, and approval of the enclosed process flow diagrams as Models on March 18, 2004.

See the Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee (SUIS) meeting minutes, attachments, and transcripts for the supporting documentation, discussion, and voting records for the following dates:

- August 5, 2002
- August 9, 2002
- September 18-19, 2002
- October 21, 2003
- November 8, 2002
- January 8, 2003
- February 14, 2003
- February 25, 2003
- April 3, 2003
- April 30, 2003
- May 15, 2003
- June 19, 2003
- July 15-16, 2003
- July 31, 2003
- August 11, 2003
- September 11, 2003
- December 3, 2003
- January 13, 2004
- March 3, 2004
- March 18, 2004

c. Business Purpose:
The business purpose for the proposed Model Business Practices is to facilitate the establishment of working relationships between Distribution Companies and Suppliers to enable them to serve retail access Customers. The practices do so by presenting a consistent process for establishing credit between the parties in the context of serving retail access Customers.

d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):

The proposed Model Business Practices were developed in a consensus-oriented process with active participation from all four REQ Segments: Distributors, Suppliers, Services, and End-Users. That a degree of consensus was reached is evidenced by the passage of a motion during the March 18, 2004 conference call to recommend all four Model Process Flow Diagrams under consideration to the Executive Committee. However, only the Distributor and Supplier Segments of REQ were represented at the March 18, 2004 conference call.

The voting record of March 18, 2004 follows:

 Joint REQ/RGQ SUIS Conference Call - March 18, 2004
Voting Record on Motion to Approve Creditworthiness Process Flow Diagrams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Date: 3/18/2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion:</td>
<td>Motion for approval of the Creditworthiness process flow diagrams as amended on today's call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ</td>
<td>Moved: Mary Edwards Seconded: Kathy Yetman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ</td>
<td>Moved: Dan Rothfuss Seconded: Mike Coyle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Tally</th>
<th>Raw Votes</th>
<th>Balanced Votes</th>
<th>Motion Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Users</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Users</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint REQ/RGQ SUIS Conference Call - March 18, 2004
Voting Record on Motion to Approve Creditworthiness Process Flow Diagrams

### Retail Electric Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesters</th>
<th>Motion # 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQ - Distributors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Camp - Southern Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Eynon - Ameren</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Newbold - Detroit Edison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Ray - Alabama Power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Thiry - Wisconsin Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wolfe - BG&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Yetman - National Grid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Edwards - Dominion Va Power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQ - Distribution Companies Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQ - Suppliers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Adams - Georgia Power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQ - Suppliers Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retail Gas Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesters</th>
<th>Motion # 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RGQ - Local Distribution Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Coyle - PSE&amp;G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Nishida - Wisconsin Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rothfuss - Cinergy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RGQ - LDC's Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RGQ - Suppliers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy McCain - Duke Energy Gas Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RGQ - Suppliers Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Recommended Action:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> Accept as Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Accept as modified below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> Change to Existing Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Status Quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Request:</th>
<th>Per Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> Initiation</td>
<td><strong>X</strong> Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Modification</td>
<td>___ Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Interpretation</td>
<td>___ Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Withdrawal</td>
<td>___ Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Principle</td>
<td>___ Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Definition</td>
<td>___ Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> Model Business Practice</td>
<td><strong>X</strong> Model Business Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Document</td>
<td>___ Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Data Element</td>
<td>___ Data Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Code Value</td>
<td>___ Code Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ X12 Implementation Guide</td>
<td>___ X12 Implementation Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Business Process Documentation</td>
<td>___ Business Process Documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY:

Add proposed NAESB RGQ Model Business Practices (Models) to the existing RGQ Model Business Practices on Creditworthiness:

Process flow diagrams to be added as Models within the existing MBP’s:

1) Determination of Initial Credit Limits – Process Flow as MBP 1.3.3.1
2) Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit – Process Flow as MBP 1.4.3.1
3) Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit – Challenge Process Flow as MBP 1.4.3.2
4) Disqualification/Remedies = Process Flow as MBP 1.5.3.1.
Proposed Model Business Practices:

Model Business Practice 1.3.3.1

Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Process Flow

Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.3.3.1)

Key:
Solid Lines = Normal Process
Dashed Lines = Exceptions

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/18/2004)
Model Business Practice 1.4.3.1

Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Process Flow
Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.4.3.1)

Applicant
- Request Reconsideration by Creditor
  - Receives Reconsideration Request
    - Rec'd <=30 Days of Determination?
      - Yes: Go to Challenge Process Flow Diagram
      - No: Material Change?
        - Yes: Same Process as "Determination of Initial Credit Limit" (See MBP 1.3.3.1 Process Flow Diagram)
        - No: Send Credit Application Form to Applicant

Creditor
- Initiate Reconsideration
  - Time for Periodic Review or Aware of Material Change?
    - Yes: Send Notice Denying Reconsideration Request
    - No: Yes

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames
Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/16/2004)
Model Business Practice 1.4.3.2

Reconsideration of Determination of Initial Credit Limit - Challenge Process Flow
Creditworthiness Evaluation Process (Section 1.4.3.2)

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames
RECOMMENDATION TO NAESB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
RETAIL GAS QUADRANT

Requester: RGQ Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee
Request No.: 2002-2003 Annual Plan Item 2

Model Business Practice 1.5.3.1

Disqualification/Remedies - Process Flow
Disqualification/Remedies (Section 1.5.3.1)

Applicant

Stop
Yes
No

Ask to Reduce Security?

R=S

Stop

Request New (Lower) Security Arrangement

Requests Made via Overnight, Fax, or E-mail

Action Taken

Reduce Risk Exposure
None

New (Lower) Security Arrangement in Place

Done

Credit

Stop

R=S

Stop

[Risk vs. (Security)?]

R>S

Stop

[Request Add'l Security?]

Yes

Send Request for Add'l Security

Creditor Request Received

Provide Add'l Security

Reduce Risk Exposure
None

New (Lower) Security Arrangement in Place

Done

Applicant Request Received

New (Lower) Security Arrangement

Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx

Note: Individual Model Business Practice (MBP) Numbers Cited Only When They Specify Time Frames

(Ratification Date xx/xx/xxxx
(Version Approved by SUIS 3/18/2004)
4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

2003-2003 Annual Plan Item 2 - Develop practices for extending commercial credit by Distributors to Supplier to cover financial risk. These models complete the work on Creditworthiness.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee

The proposed Model Business Practices are the result of a series of meetings and conference calls held by the Retail Gas Quadrant's Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee begun in the Fall of 2002, resulting in approval of Model Business practices on an August 11, 2003 Conference Call, approval of introductory sections on January 13, 2004, and approval of the enclosed process flow diagrams as Models on March 18, 2004.

See the Supplier-Utility Interface Subcommittee (SUIS) meeting minutes, attachments, and transcripts for the supporting documentation, discussion, and voting records for the following dates:

August 5, 2002
August 9, 2002
September 18-19, 2002
October 21, 2003
November 8, 2002
January 8, 2003
February 14, 2003
February 25, 2003
April 3, 2003
April 30, 2003
May 15, 2003
June 19, 2003
July 15-16, 2003
July 31, 2003
August 11, 2003
September 11, 2003
December 3, 2003
January 13, 2004
March 3, 2004
March 18, 2004

c. Business Purpose:
The business purpose for the proposed Model Business Practices is to facilitate the establishment of working relationships between Distribution Companies and Suppliers to enable them to serve retail access Customers. The practices do so by presenting a consistent process for establishing credit between the parties in the context of serving retail access Customers.

d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):

The proposed Model Business Practices were developed in a consensus-oriented process with active participation from all four RGQ Segments: Distributors, Suppliers, Services, and End-Users. That a degree of consensus was reached in evidenced by the passage of a motion during the March 18, 2004 conference call to recommend all four Model Process Flow Diagrams under consideration to the Executive Committee. However, only the Local Distribution Company and Supplier Segments of RGQ were represented at the March 18, 2004 conference call.

The voting record of March 18, 2004 follows:

**Joint REQ/RGQ SUIS Conference Call - March 18, 2004**

**Voting Record on Motion to Approve Creditworthiness Process Flow Diagrams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Date: 3/18/2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion:</td>
<td>Motion for approval of the Creditworthiness process flow diagrams as amended on today's call.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQ**
- Moved: Mary Edwards
- Seconded: Kathy Yetman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Tally</th>
<th>Raw Votes</th>
<th>Balanced Votes</th>
<th>Motion Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ</td>
<td>End Users</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RGQ**
- Moved: Dan Rothfuss
- Seconded: Mike Coyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Tally</th>
<th>Raw Votes</th>
<th>Balanced Votes</th>
<th>Motion Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ</td>
<td>End Users</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint REQ/RGQ SUIS Conference Call - March 18, 2004

Voting Record on Motion to Approve Creditworthiness Process Flow Diagrams

### Retail Electric Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion # 1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQ - Distributors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yvette Camp - Southern Company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Patrick Eynon - Ameren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bill Newbold - Detroit Edison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Judy Ray - Alabama Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ken Thiry - Wisconsin Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bill Wolfe - BG&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kathy Yetman - National Grid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mary Edwards - Dominion Va Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ - Distribution Companies Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ - Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tan Adams - Georgia Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQ - Suppliers Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retail Gas Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion # 1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGQ - Local Distribution Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mike Coyle - PSE&amp;G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Les Nishida - Wisconsin Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dan Rothfuss - Cinergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ - LDC's Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ - Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Marcy McCain - Duke Energy Gas Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGQ - Suppliers Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>