

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**SEPTEMBER 12, 1997**



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.	Introduction Material	Tab 1
	- Meeting Announcement and Agenda	
	- Antitrust Guidelines	
	- Draft Minutes of August 13, 1997 <sup>1</sup>	
2.	Recommended Standards and Interpretations	Tab 2
3.	Recommended Actions on New Requests	Tab 3
4.	ANSI and Disa Issues	Tab 4
5.	Definitions Task Force	Tab 5
6.	Internet "Look and Feel" Group Resolution	Tab 6
7.	Other Business Items	Tab 7

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcripts of the August 13 meeting can be ordered from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting, by calling 512-882-9037.

---



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997**

---

**1. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

- The meeting is held at:

Wyndham Warwick Hotel  
5701 Main Street  
Houston, Texas  
Phone: 713-757-4175

Room: LaFontaine B & C

- Times are:

Friday, September 12, 1997:                      9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

The chairman may elect to extend the hours of the meeting if more time is required to complete the agenda.

- For further assistance please reach :

Veronica Thomason at      (713) 757 - 4175

- The officers presiding over the Executive Committee meeting are:

Mike Bray	- Chairman
Jerry Hahn	- Vice-Chair
Rae McQuade	- Executive Director

- Transcripts will be available from Jane Copeland, Ak/Ret Reporting, Inc. and can be ordered either during the meeting, or by calling 512-882-9037.



## 1. ANTITRUST GUIDELINES

- GISB General Counsel Dennis Holbrook will review the antitrust guidelines. The points are :

Antitrust guidelines direct meeting participants to avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior including: restraint of trade and conspiracies to monopolize, unfair or deceptive business acts or practices, price discriminations, division of markets, allocation of production, imposition of boycotts, and exclusive dealing arrangements.



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

- The proposed agenda, attached, has been distributed and is available on GISB's home page.
- **The Executive Committee is requested to review the agenda, suggest changes if needed, and vote to adopt the agenda.**



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925  
Houston, Texas, 77002

Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email [gisb@aol.com](mailto:gisb@aol.com)

September 2, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page  
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
RE: Upcoming September 12 Executive Committee Meeting & Agenda

## MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT:

Attached please find the draft agenda for the upcoming Executive Committee meeting. Materials will be provided shortly by mail to Executive Committee members and will be posted on the GISB home page in the "EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE" area. As noticed in the Standards Action Bulletin, the meeting will be held in Houston on September 12.

Where: Wyndham Warwick Hotel  
5701 Main Street  
Houston, Texas  
Phone: 713-757-4175

When: September 12, 1997  
9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. (a working lunch will be provided)

To prepare for this meeting, you should access the requests and related minutes of subcommittees on the home page. **The EC meeting will conclude at the time specified on the agenda unless the chairman determines that the meeting times should be extended to address all agenda items.**

A transcript will be taken for the EC meeting. You can order the transcripts during the meeting. You can also order the transcripts of the all of the meetings held in 1997 from Jane Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting.

**Please notify the GISB office by September 9** of your intent to attend so that appropriate meeting and lunch arrangements can be made. I look forward to seeing you in Houston. Please feel free to call if you have any questions or comments.

cc: Dennis Holbrook  
Laurie Paulson  
Posting on GISB Home Page for access to all GISB members and other interested parties



## GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The Wyndham Warwick Hotel  
5701 Main Street, Houston, Texas

### PROPOSED AGENDA

September 12, 1997 -- 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

- 9:00 a.m. 1. Welcome
- Antitrust Guidelines
  - Welcome to members and attendees
  - Adoption of Agenda
  - Adoption of the Draft Minutes of August 13, 1997
- 9:15 a.m. 2. Review of Recommended Standards and Interpretations
- Discussion
  - Vote by Executive Committee Members at a "17/2" Level  
19 Recommendations for standards or interpretations are to be discussed for possible adoption. They are C96024, C97010, C97011, R96120, R96125B, R97006, R97009-1, R97009-2, R97010, R97016, R97029, R97039, R97044, R97050, R97051, R97054, R97055, R97056, R97057.
  - There are 5 hours allotted to this agenda item. Approximately 15 minutes will be devoted to each recommended standard or interpretation.
- Noon WORKING LUNCH
- 12:45 p.m. 2. Continuation of Agenda Item 2
- 3:00 p.m. 3. Scope Determination and Triage Actions
- Scope determination on New Requests : Discussion and Procedural Vote
  - Triage Actions for New Requests : Discussion and Procedural Vote
- 4:00 p.m. 4. ANSI and DISA Issues
- 4:30 p.m. 5. Definitions Task Force Continuation of Discussion from August 13
- 5:00 p.m. 6. Resolution regarding Inernet "Look and Feel" group
- Resolution (simple majority vote after discussion)
7. Other Business Items
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn

**Note: The business attire is business casual. The Chairman, at his discretion, may extend the hours of the meeting to ensure that all agenda items are addressed.**



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- The minutes of August 13, 1997 were posted on the home page for review and are included in these materials for vote to adopt.
- **The Executive Committee is requested to review the draft minutes, suggest changes if needed, and vote to adopt as minutes of the meeting.**



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
Executive Committee Meeting  
August 13, 1997 -- 10:00 a.m. to - 5:30 p.m.**

**Army and Navy Club, Washington D.C.  
DRAFT MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee members to Washington. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. The agenda was adopted with no changes. Draft Executive Committee minutes from July 10, 1997 were reviewed and adopted with changes.

**II. Recommended Standards and Interpretations**

**R97054:**

For the proposed recommended standard for R97054, Mr. Lander reviewed the materials provided and responded to questions.

- 1.3.x "For requests to confirm and confirmation response processes, all parties should seek to confirm all transactions with respect to a location by means of communicating at the applicable detail or summary level."

The motion was made and seconded to adopt above proposed standard. The roll was called, and the vote was taken. The vote result was unanimous in favor : 18 in favor, none opposed, and at least two positive votes in favor from each segment. The motion passed. The standard will go out for ratification in September with the standards passed in the September Executive Committee meeting.

**C97002A:**

For the proposed recommended interpretation C97002A, several suggested clarifications were discussed and reflected in the below text:

"GISB Standard No. 1.3.3 states that "In addition to making scheduled quantities information available by 4:30 p.m., at the end of each day transportation service providers should also make available to shippers information containing scheduled quantities, including scheduled intraday nominations and any other scheduling changes."

This means that a new scheduled quantity document would be made available at the end of each gas day, and would contain all of the transactions scheduled for the just completed gas day. The information concerning the prior (i.e., just completed) gas day would be made available to the service requesters regardless of when the nomination or activity giving rise to the scheduled quantity was initially submitted to or processed by the transportation service provider."

Mr. Love submitted changes to the interpretation in the comments submitted by NGPL and proposed that they be adopted, (the NGPL comments can be downloaded from the GISB Home Page in the "Executive Committee" area). Mr. Scheel asked that the amended interpretation, as stated above, be adopted and then sent to the Business Practices Subcommittee for review and possible changes to existing standards. Mr. Novak noted that the interpretation could impact current efforts in the Intraday Task Force. The motion was made and seconded that the amended interpretation as reflected above be adopted. Discussion by Executive Committee members and participants ensued. Mr. Walker asked that this

proposal be tabled until the Business Practices Subcommittee has reviewed the proposal and the response has been received regarding the Interpretation Subcommittee question sent to the Business Practices Subcommittee regarding "sent" versus "available".

Ms. Corman made a motion that the proposal be tabled. As a procedural vote, there were seven votes in favor and eleven votes opposed. The motion to table the proposal failed, and discussion resumed. After a three minute recess, the meeting reconvened. The motion on the table -- to adopt the amended interpretation was stated. A vote was called and the proposed interpretation passed unanimously with 18 votes in favor, and at least two affirmative votes from each segment. There were no opposing votes recorded.

### **R97035 & R97060:**

The recommended model trading partner agreements represented by requests R97035 and R97060 were reviewed by Ms. Loewen. Ms. Loewen responded to questions, and the question was raised: "Are these two opposing documents, or are these both models that could be used?" While the votes would be procedural for adopting two models -- they are not standards -- the question was asked on what would happen if both models passed. The sentiment was expressed that only one model should be in existence as a GISB Operating Practice and whichever model was adopted by the Executive Committee today or in subsequent meetings would replace the existing model. A lunch break was called.

After lunch, the procedure for discussing the models was outlined. A representative was chosen to describe each model and respond to questions, both allotted the same amount of time. After the two presentations, motions will be made for voting on the models or to table the discussions and vote in the September meeting. Ms. Dickson on Enron Capital and Trade presented model II (R97060) and responded to and participated in the discussion. Several changes were identified but no decisions on those changes were made. Ms. Loewen presented model I (R97035) and responded to and participated in discussion. The specifics of the discussions held can be found in the transcripts of the meeting which can be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting (512-882-9037).

At this time, Ms. Davis joined the Executive Committee as an alternate representing Mr. Wolgel. After discussions, a procedural motion in two parts was made by Mr. Kretsch and seconded and amended by others with his approval. The first part of the motion was: "To adopt the model I (R97035) as recommended model to replace the existing Model Trading Partner Agreement", and the second part was: "To review the approved Model Trading Partner Agreement for adoption as a standard with modifications in light of the comments and modifications discussed during model II (R97060)". The motion passed with fourteen in favor and four against. The approved Model Trading Partner Agreement will be forwarded to the Contracts Subcommittee for consideration of changes highlighted in model II. When the Contracts Subcommittee has completed its review, the proposed amended model will be brought back to the Executive Committee for consideration and vote as a standard. A brief break was called.

### **III. Disposition of New Requests**

The meeting reconvened with discussion on new requests. Three requests are to be considered: R9708, R97109, and R97110. At this time, Mr. Gracey joined the Executive Committee as an alternate representing Mr. Walker. A motion was made and seconded to find all requests within scope. As a procedural vote, there were fourteen votes in favor and none opposed.

Request R97108 was reviewed by Mr. Lander. The Triage direction on the request was approved by 16 votes with none opposed to send the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee with an immediate priority, to be discussed with the nominations issues currently under consideration.

Request R97110 was reviewed by Mr. Lander. The Triage direction on the request was approved by 16 votes with none opposed to send the request to the Business Practices Subcommittee to be discussed with the capacity release issues, with the discussions to begin in September and be resolved by the end of the year.

Request R97109 was reviewed by Mr. Lander. He noted that it was the determination of the Triage Group that the business practice issues are clear regarding this request and the following should

be used as an instruction to the Information Requirements Subcommittee for fully staffed work as a standard with the following proposed standard:

- 1.3.x: The field length of contract numbers associated with Standards No. 1.4.x, 2.4.x, 3.4.x and 5.4.x and their related implementation guides, and the field length of the remittance numbers associated with Standard No. 3.4.2 and related implementation guide items should use a field length of 12 characters instead of the current 30-character field length.

The priority recommended by the Traige Group is immediate. On discussion, Mr. Caldwell noted that while the 30 character field length is defined for contract number, the full 30 characters do not need to be populated. It would be permissible to use up to twelve characters. It was noted that the confirmation process would require some limit agreed to by the confirming parties for the number of characters used for contract number.

There was a motion made and seconded for the Executive Committee to address request R97109 today. The motion passed with 17 votes in favor and none opposed. There was further discussion on the need for twelve, fourteen or thirty characters for contract number, remittance number and associated contract number. Mr. Novak noted that some LDCs need as many as 16 characters for account number which is their contract number for billing. After further discussions, it was determined that further investigation is needed -- a Canadian pipeline may need 30 characters, and gatherers, intrastate pipelines and LDCs should be polled for their requirements. At this time, Ms. Hess joined the Executive Committee as an alternate for Ms. Corman. The motion was made and seconded and amended that the following be sent out as a recommended standard for industry comment:

*"The field length of contract numbers associated with Standards No. 1.4.x, 2.4.x, 3.4.x and 5.4.x and their related implementation guides, and the field length of the remittance numbers associated with Standard No. 3.4.2 and related implementation guide items should use a field length no longer than 12 characters instead of the current 30-character field length."*

In discussion, it was noted that the "contract numbers" phrase in the proposed standard above refer to all data elements that are contract numbers, not just the data element entitled "contract number". The vote was taken with 14 in favor and one abstention. The above proposed standard will be sent out for industry comment in September and brought back for Executive Committee vote in October.

#### **IV. Process Subcommittee Update**

Mr. Boswell highlighted the meeting held earlier in the day for the Process Subcommittee. At that meeting, no decisions were made or votes taken. The discussions addressed processes for subcommittees and can be further reviewed in the minutes of the Process Subcommittee.

#### **V. Minor Corrections and Errata**

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the six corrections presented to the Executive Committee through memorandum by Ms. Munson of the GISB office. There was no discussion. The motion passed with 17 votes in favor and two votes from each segment. There were no opposing votes. An errata notice will be posted on the GISB Home Page, the standards manuals and booklets corrected, and all holders of the manuals and the booklets will receive a printed errata in the mail.

#### **VI. FERC Report**

Mr. Holbrook identified the procedures by which the report is to be drafted:

- (1) Subcommittee and Task Force chairs submit reports to the GISB office by August 15 responding to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) questions highlighted in Order 587 series of orders (primarily Order 587C and Order 587D).
- (2) A report will be drafted by Mr. Holbrook regarding the reports received. There will be no substantive changes to the report from the updates received for the chairs.
- (3) Assuming all reports are received by August 15, a draft report will be forwarded to the Editorial Review Board on August 22.

- (4) The Editorial Review Board will review and suggest changes to the report.
- (5) The report will be forwarded to the Commission on September 1.

Ms. Hess gave a verbal update on the OBA issues, the content of which will suffice as the subcommittee report to the GISB office which will be used to prepare the September 1 report to the Commission. The content of the oral report is contained within the transcripts, a written copy was not provided.

The task force and subcommittee updates due on August 15 will be posted for review. The draft September 1 report will be forwarded to the Executive Committee members at the same time that it is sent to the Editorial Review Board for approval. Those Executive Committee members that have comments should discuss them with the voting members of the Editorial Review Board. Mr. Lander gave an oral report, which is also contained in the transcripts.

## **VII. Definitions Task Force**

Mr. Kardas noted the divergent views in the task force: (1) continue to develop a glossary, and (2) disband the task force for the time being. In support of development of the glossary, Ms. Loewen noted that the glossary is not to be considered standards, rather procedural and to be used as reference material. Also in support of the development of the glossary, Mr. Novak added that a glossary is needed, and if there are controversial items, do not include them in the glossary or define them in generic terms such that the controversy is avoided. In support of temporary postponement of the task force, Mr. Wolgel noted that resources are scarce, this effort is considerable, and at this time there are many active issues in front of GISB. However, Mr. Wolgel noted that he would support a context specific need approach for definitions, which would be more resource efficient. Ms. Lynch added that this effort might be better addressed by third party service providers.

The list of 275 terms to be defined was created through an industry request to provide needed terms for definitions to the task force. Mr. Kretsch added that there are two ways to develop standards: (1) review the standards and identify the terms needed - to provide cross reference and definition or (2) within the context of a request to industry for terms, identify the terms needed. The second way can be more time consuming. He noted that the first way seems more useful to provide consistency to our standards and reduce ambiguity. Mr. Novak added his support for the statements made by Mr. Kretsch. Ms. Lynch noted that she was not yet convinced of the value added. Mr. White noted that the AGA puts out a glossary every few years, and he added that the creation of a GISB glossary would serve a public relations service to the industry.

Mr. Wolgel stated that as a compromise, he could support a cross reference for those terms that already have definitions within the GISB standards and also for those items that have caused many misunderstandings. Ms. Loewen thought that the cross reference creation would be a good place for the process to begin. Mr. Hahn observed that definitions were needed as part of an educational process. Ms. Corman noted that the Definitions Task Force needs a better filtering process if the creation of definitions is to be pursued, but she also supported Ms. Lynch's assertion that a commercial solution would be better. Mr. Wolgel reiterated his preference for a context specific approach, and Ms. Lynch reiterated her concern on the value added to the organization and the industry as a result of this effort in light of the many outstanding issues in front of GISB. The support for definitions provided by K. N. Energy has been withdrawn by K. N. Energy, but the definitions themselves still exist a part of the public record, and are still considered as task force work papers, and they are also before the task force. The reference to K.N. Energy as a supporter will be withdrawn. Mr. Wolgel made the motion that the mission of the Definitions Task Force is: "Identify all defined terms in the GISB standards and provide a cross reference, and table any further responsibilities for the Definitions Task Force at this time." No action was taken on the motion. Mr. Kardas asked that the following questions be answered: (1) the scope of the Definitions Task Force, (2) the method by which a glossary is to be created, if it is to be created, (3) the expectations of the Executive Committee for a final product. Mr. Hahn made a motion that the issue be tabled for this meeting, which was seconded. A vote was called and the motion to table the discussion passed.

**XII. Adjourn**

The next meeting will be held in September 12 in Houston and the October meeting will be held on October 9 in Houston. There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded and passed. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**XII. Attendance**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

SEGMENT	ATTENDING	MEMBERS/ALTERNATES	VOTING RESULTS <sup>1</sup>		
			R97054	C97002A	R97035
END USERS:	✓	Mary Lynch for Kristine Mespelli	✓	✓	✓
		Vacancy			
	✓	Lee Smith	✓	✓	✓
	✗ <sup>2</sup>	Lynette Wilson			
LDCs:		Vacancy			
	✓	William Boswel	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Darlene Buchholz	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Kirt Kleinman	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Mike Novak	✓	✓	✓
PIPELINES:	✗	Gary Beland			
	✓	Mike Bray	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Shelley Corman <sup>3</sup> for Max Feldman	✓	✓	✗
	✓	Paul Love for vacancy	✓	✓	✗
	✓	Fred Wolgel <sup>4</sup>	✓	✓	✗
PRODUCERS:	✓	Norm Walker <sup>5</sup>	✓	✓	✗
	✓	Jerry Hahn	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Tom Ehinger	✓	✓	✓
		Vacancy			
	✗	Hugh Roberts			
SERVICES:	✓	Bob Wallenhorst	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Carl Caldwell	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Steve Kretsch for Dave Pfeifer	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Cheryl Loewen	✓	✓	✓
	✓	Mark Scheel for the vacancy	✓	✓	✓
	✗	Keith Sappenfield			

Administrative: Rae McQuade, - Executive Director  
 Veronica Thomason - GISB Staff  
 Dennis Holbrook - General Counsel  
 Jane Copeland - Ak/Ret Reporting  
 Laurie Paulson - Hoffman-Paulson Associates

<sup>1</sup> The two motions voted on by the Executive Committee which required 17 total votes to pass, including at least two affirmative votes from each segment were requests R97054 and C97002A. Request R97035 required a simple majority as it was a procedural motion to adopt a model.

<sup>2</sup> Those Executive Committee members absent were given an opportunity to cast their votes notationally based on the amended language from the meeting. For proposed actions, Mr. Sappenfield had submitted his notational ballot prior to the meeting, but was re-balloted for those motions that were altered in the meeting.

<sup>3</sup> Theresa Hess represented Shelley Corman for a portion of the meeting.

<sup>4</sup> Dale Davis represented Fred Wolgel for a portion of the meeting.

<sup>5</sup> Mark Gracey represented Norm Walker for a portion of the meeting.

<u>Observers:</u>			<u>Members</u>
	Charlie Bass	Midwestern Gas Transmission	X
	Catherine Calpotura	Pacific Gas & Electric	✓
	Cynthia Corcoran	Texas Eastern	✓
	Shelley Corman	Transwestern	✓
	Dale Davis	Transco	✓
	Julie Dennis	Koch Gateway	✓
	Stacy Dickson	Enron Capital and Trade	✓
	Sharon Eady	NorAm Gas Transmission	✓
	Nancy Fitzgerald	Shell Gas Pipeline	✓
	Jean Ford	Andersen Consulting	✓
	Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓
	Theresa Hess	Nothern Natural	✓
	Shippen Howe	Van Ness Feldman	✓
	Joe Karda	National Fuel Gas Supply	✓
	Greg Lander	TransCapacity	✓
	Gary Payne	Enron Capital and Trade	✓
	Joyce Phillips	Algonquin	X
	Anne Rowland	INGAA	6
	Samir Salama	INGAA	7
	Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies	✓
	George Spencer	Restructuring Today	✓
	Laverne Tillson	Defense Fuel Supply Center	✓
	Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern	✓
	Brian White	AGA	8

- Attachments:
1. Standards and Interpretations Adopted by the Executive Committee
  2. Minor Corrections and Clarifications Adopted by the Executive Committee
  3. Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations
  4. GISB Operating Practice: Model Electronic Data Interchange Trading Partner Agreement

---

<sup>6</sup> INGAA is a formal trade liaison of GISB.

<sup>7</sup> INGAA is a formal trade liaison of GISB.

<sup>8</sup> AGA is a formal trade liaison of GISB.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

August 13, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page  
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
RE: Standards, Interpretations and Models Adopted by the Executive Committee on August 13, 1997

**R97054:**

1.3.x "For requests to confirm and confirmation response processes, all parties should seek to confirm all transactions with respect to a location by means of communicating at the applicable detail or summary level."

**C97002A**

7.1.x "GISB Standard No. 1.3.3 states that "In addition to making scheduled quantities information available by 4:30 p.m., at the end of each day transportation service providers should also make available to shippers information containing scheduled quantities, including scheduled intraday nominations and any other scheduling changes."

This means that a new scheduled quantity document would be made available at the end of each gas day, and would contain all of the transactions scheduled for the just completed gas day. The information concerning the prior (i.e., just completed) gas day would be made available to the service requesters regardless of when the nomination or activity giving rise to the scheduled quantity was initially submitted to or processed by the transportation service provider."

**R97035 & R97060:**

Model I (R97035- see attached model I) is the replacement for the existing Model Trading Partner Agreement. The Contracts Subcommittee is asked to review the approved Model Trading Partner Agreement for adoption as a standard with modifications in light of the comments and modifications discussed during model II (R97060).



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

August 13, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page  
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
RE: Minor Corrections and Errata Approved by the Executive Committee on August 13, 1997

The Executive Committee approved errata to the version 1.2 standards booklet and standards manuals. The corrections were:

## 1 R96043 - Ratified February 28, 1997

This change modified the Transaction Type "Authorized Overrun" to read "Authorized Contract Overrun" and added a Transaction Type of "Authorized Point Overrun" to the Nomination data set. This data element, with the corresponding list of transaction types is utilized in the Scheduled Quantity and Imbalance data sets in addition to the Nomination.

Solution: Accept as a minor correction in the Scheduled Quantity and Imbalance data sets, the modification of "Authorized Overrun" to read "Authorized Contract Overrun" and the addition of "Authorized Point Overrun" to the Transaction Type data element.

## 2 C96013-C96019 - Ratified February 6, 1997

These interpretations included a set of 'instructions' to be used in the changes to the manuals. Part of these instructions was a table of usage codes for each of the model types. The usage codes in the instructions included usages for the Ranks (Receipt Rank, Delivery Rank, Upstream Rank, Downstream Rank) that conflicted with their data dictionary usages.

Solution: Accept as a minor correction the modification of the usage for these ranks. The usage for each rank should be conditional with the condition stated as:

For Receipt & Delivery Ranks:

Sender's option when the model used is "Pathed", "Non-Pathed" or  
"Pathed Non-Threaded - Pathed Segment"

For Upstream & Downstream Ranks:

Sender's option when the model used is  
"Pathed Non-Threaded - Unthreaded Segment" and may be  
mutually agreed to for "Pathed" or "Non-Pathed" models.

## 3 R96112 - Ratified February 28, 1997

This request added adjustment type code values to the "Adjustment Type" data element in the Measured Volume Audit Statement. The Measured Volume Audit Statement does not have a data element named "Adjustment Type". The original request and recommendation were for the code values to be added to the Measurement Information data set which has a data element "Adjustment Type". The February 6, 1997 Executive Committee transcripts (page 385) show that the request was modified during the Executive Committee meeting to add the data element and the associated code values to the Measured Volume Audit Statement. The ballot and final action documents do not reflect addition of the data element, but the EC vote included the addition of the element.

Attachment 2 to the Executive Committee Minutes of August 13, 1997

Minor Corrections and Clarifications Adopted by the Executive Committee on August 13, 1997

Page 1



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

Solution: Accept as a minor correction the addition of the data element "Adjustment Type" and associated code values approved in R96112 to be added to the Measured Volume Audit Statement data set.

#### 4 R96010 - Ratified February 28, 1997

This request adopted a new data set, Scheduled Quantity for Operator, which contains the data element "Statement Recipient ID". The definition of this element contains the conditions when it should be used, not a definition, and these conditions conflict with the usage code for the element. The element, "Statement Recipient ID" is also used in Flowing Gas related documents.

Solution: Accept as a minor correction the modification of the definition, usage and condition of "Statement Recipient ID" in the Scheduled Quantity for Operator. It should read:

##### Statement Recipient ID

Definition: The intended user of the statement.

Usage: M

Condition: none

#### 5 R96038 - Ratified February 28, 1997

This requested modified the "Allocation Rank Level" in the Pre-Determined Allocation data set. Two versions of the definition were included in the Definition of the ratified Final Action document. This request was voted on notationally on January 17, 1997. There was no discussion of this request in the transcripts of the January Executive Committee meeting. Therefore, the language submitted by the task force should be the one that was considered to have been notationally approved.

Solution: Accept as a minor correction the modification of the definition of "Allocation Rank Level" in the Pre-Determined Allocation data set to read as was originally recommended by the task force.

##### Allocation Rank Level

Definition: Values to implement the ranking or percentage method.  
For the Rank Method priority 1 means the highest priority.  
Priority 2,3, etc. are in descending order of priority.  
Quantities assigned the same rank will be allocated on a pro rata basis. for the Percentage method enter the appropriate percentage.

#### 6 Standard 2.3.9 - modified in Version 1.1

Standard 2.3.9 was modified in Version 1.1 of GISB standards. This standard was not correctly reflected in the Flowing Gas Related Standards manual with the new language.

Solution: Accept as a minor correction the inclusion of the correct language for Standard 2.3.9, as reported in the Standards Booklet Version 1.1 and Version 1.2.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

August 13, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page  
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
RE: Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations on August 13, 1997

The Executive Committee met on August 13, 1997 and took action on the following new requests for standards.

R97108 Change the usage code of the Capacity Type Indicator contained in Standard 1.4.1 from Mutually Agreeable (MA) to Business Conditional (BC).

From: Texas Gas Transmission

Summary: Please see the request on the GISB Home Page. The request was not submitted electronically for summarization.

Triage: Send to Business Practices Subcommittee.

Priority: Immediate priority.

EC Action: The request was found within scope. The actions recommended by the Triage Group for direction to the Business Practices Subcommittee with an immediate priority (to be discussed with the nominations issues currently under consideration) were approved.

R97109 Change the field length of contract numbers associated with Standards No. 1.4.x, 2.4.x, 3.4.x and 5.4.x and their related implementation guides and change the remittance numbers associated with Standard No. 3.4.2 and related implementation guide items to utilize a field length of 12 characters instead of the current 30-character field length.

From: INGAA

Summary: INGAA asks that GISB send this request directly to the Executive Committee for discussion at its August 13, 1997 meeting because a similar request has already been discussed and supported by the Market Execution Task Force (METF). Unlike the earlier request, however, this new request does not ask for a change in the field length for the Package I.D. number. INGAA's motivation in submitting this request is to avoid costly modifications to TSP's existing information systems to conform to a field length of 30 characters for contract and remittance numbers.

INGAA believes that its requested modification to data dictionaries and implementation guides relating to field lengths for contract number and remittance number is critical in order to avoid major redesign and restructuring of existing TSP, and possibly Service Requesters, information systems to install a 30-character field length in all applications that utilize the contract number and the remittance number fields. The following is a more detailed background about this request.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

For the Service Requester's Contract Number, designation of a contract number is a function performed by the TSP and is a data element that is interwoven throughout a TSP's entire information system. Contract numbers are utilized as an index key field throughout the TSP information systems to track multiple processes and transactions, including contracts, capacity release, nominations, scheduling, allocations, confirmations, imbalance statements and invoicing. Changing the field size for contract numbers would require a TSP to change virtually every element of its data retrieval and storage systems. For example, to make the changes for only one TSP's system, it has been estimated that it would require changing 173 table/views (places where data is stored) and 1,138 programs (batch and on-line screens). Making these changes could have detrimental side effects on the TSP's entire data retrieval and storage system, including increased disk storage and potential performance (speed) degradation. In addition, the change to 30-character fields is likely to cause existing single screen view and reports to be split into more cumbersome multiple screens, resulting in increased customer frustration and decreased shipper satisfaction. Furthermore, requiring TSP's to change the length of the contract number data element to 30 characters at this time in the development of electronic communication serves no purpose. TSP's existing systems typically have designated contract number field length of various sizes from 3 to 12. These are contract numbers currently in use in the industry and none of these numbers require a 30-character field length.

For the Remittance Number, INGAA is also asking that remittance numbers be limited to an alphanumeric field length not to exceed 12 characters. Typically, the remittance number is a function of a check number, a wire transfer number, and/or Automatic Clearinghouse ("ACH") number. Experience has shown that six to eight characters are usually sufficient for a remittance number. Standard off-the-shelf software programs are typically utilized by many industries, not just natural gas, to process invoices and payments. Two widely used such programs are systems included in the American Software and the People Soft packages. Neither software program has been designed to accommodate a 30-character field length for a remittance number. Therefore, accounts receivable software widely utilized in the industry cannot accommodate a 30-character field length for a remittance number. Moreover, allowing the field length for the remittance number to be set at a shorter length that is consistent with the TSP's existing information systems would have no impact on service requesters because the remittance number is utilized internally by the TSP for tracking of payments and is not echoed back to service requesters for processing purposes.

As discussed above there are both tangible and intangible benefits to allowing TSPs to utilize a 12-character field length in their existing systems for both contract number and remittance number. As described in more detail above, changes to the software packages and databases can be both costly and burdensome. With such a substantial change to an existing TSP storage and retrieval information systems, there is the

---

Attachment 3 to the Executive Committee Minutes of August 13, 1997

Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations on August 13, 1997

Page 3



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

risk that the system's performance would be affected after the changes. Of equal importance, the costs of changing the contract number to 30 characters for only one major interstate pipeline system is estimated to be approximately \$1.5 million dollars. This amount could be greater or less depending on the size of the TSP system and the nature of the TSP's storage and retrieval system.

There are no incremental costs to implement the proposed standard or enhancement. In fact the proposed clarification would eliminate millions of dollars of TSP's reprogramming costs. The elimination of these costs is consistent with the Commission's indications in Order No. 587-E<sup>9</sup> where the Commission has stated that it expects transportation service providers to start moving to Internet technologies. It would be inconsistent with the direction to move toward new Internet technologies and to require pipelines to invest significant amounts of money in existing EBB proprietary systems. However, as future systems are developed, GISB standards providing different alphanumeric character lengths could be implemented without significant additional costs.

For legal or other considerations related to contract number, the Executive Committee has already reviewed one request relating to changing the field length for contract number, package I.D. number, and upstream and downstream contract identifier in request number R96057 submitted by El Paso Natural Gas. The recommendation of the Market Execution Task Force ("METF") which reviewed request No. R96057 was to limit the field length for contract numbers to a length that would be consistent with existing information systems. In notational ballot, the Executive Committee rejected this recommendation. The transcript of the January 9, 1997 EC meeting at pp. 334-341 indicates that the major concern was setting a limitation on the package I.D. number rather than the contract number. INGAA is not requesting here that the package I.D. number be limited to a length less than 30 characters.

The request before the Executive Committee at this time is more limited than request No. R96057 and affects only two data elements that are integral to TSP's existing information systems. TransCapacity Limited Partnership, who objected to the METF's recommendation at the January 9, 1997 EC meeting, stated that it would agree to a field length consistent with existing systems for contract number. In comments filed at GISB by TransCapacity on Request No. R96057, TransCapacity recognized that the Service Requester contract length was "an imposition on TSPs, (one that they can deal with on their own by simply not making contracts with identifiers greater than twelve or for that matter six characters if they want). The portion of the standard request that we feel is most objectionable is limitation on the length of the sender's option field, Package I.D." In addition, in a pleading entitled "Request for Rehearing by TransCapacity" in Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Docket No. RP97-3-001, filed April 11, 1997, TransCapacity stated that "TransCapacity is certainly agreeable to letting

---

<sup>9</sup> 79 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,137 (1997).



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

service providers limit themselves to only 12-character contract identifiers."

An additional concern expressed by a member of the EC when Request No. R96057 was being discussed was that limitation of field length would not be compliant with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) requirements. Reviewing the process GISB has utilized to turn ANSI general documents into GISB gas specific industry documents should help clarify this matter. There are numerous occasions where GISB has utilized an ANSI document and made changes in order for it to be consistent with gas industry needs. For example, the GISB nomination data set is in fact an adapted purchase order data set from ANSI. The GISB request for confirmation data set is actually a request for confirmation of purchase orders in ANSI documents. There are numerous such examples of these changes.

Since the January 9, 1997 time frame, the Executive Committee has approved a number of codes or changes to data elements which are not strictly consistent with the boundaries of the current ANSI standards. Moreover, the question of the appropriate length of data fields has been left open in the GISB implementation guides. GISB has given no guidance as to the appropriate application of these ANSI standard fields. When the Executive Committee was reviewing Request No. R96057 it was very early in the request review process and there have been numerous changes to procedures utilized since that time.

For specific legal or other considerations related to remittance number, a previous request to limit the data field length for the remittance number was submitted by the PanEnergy Corporation as request No. R96102. The Market Settlement Task Force ("MSTF") which reviewed this request in January 1997 recommended that the remittance field length be limited to a number that was consistent with TSP's existing information systems. The MSTF recommendation was based on a unanimous show of support from all members of the Task Force present. PanEnergy later withdrew this request at an EC meeting where R96102 was being discussed when it appeared that the EC would not accept the MSTF recommendation and that the appropriate technical expertise was not present to explain the needed change.

As a final statement, all interstate pipelines are successfully utilizing contract and remittance numbers with field lengths much smaller than 30 characters.

**Triage:** The business practice issues are clear and should be addressed at the next Executive Committee meeting as a proposed standard:

1.3.x: The field length of contract numbers associated with Standards No. 1.4.x, 2.4.x, 3.4.x and 5.4.x and their related implementation guides, and the field length of the remittance numbers associated with Standard No. 3.4.2 and related implementation guide items should use a field length of 12 characters instead of the current 30-character field length.

**Priority:** Immediate priority.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

EC Action: The request was found within scope. The Executive Committee recommended the following standard to be sent out for industry comment and discussed at the October Executive Committee meeting:

1.3.x: "The field length of contract numbers associated with Standards No. 1.4.x, 2.4.x, 3.4.x and 5.4.x and their related implementation guides, and the field length of the remittance numbers associated with Standard No. 3.4.2 and related implementation guide items should use a field length no longer than 12 characters instead of the current 30-character field length."

In discussion, it was noted that the "contract numbers" phrase in the proposed standard above refer to all data elements that are contract numbers, not just the data element entitled "contract number".

R97110

The time appearing in the field "Posting Date/Time" should be the the time that the completed Offer, Bid, Award, and Notice of Withdrawal (as applicable) first appeared on the Transportation Service Provider's Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB) as a completed activity (or reached the completed state, in the event there was no EBB involved in the transaction).

From : TransCapacity

Summary: The request addresses the the date time stamp appearing in the the capacity release datasets in the field called Posting Date/Time. The time appearing in the field "Posting Date/Time" should be the the time that the completed Offer, Bid, Award, and Notice of Withdrawal (as applicable) first appeared on the Transportation Service Provider's Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB) as a completed activity (or reached the completed state, in the event there was no EBB involved in the transaction). The proposed standard would allow the data requester to receive data and know when it was FIRST posted to the Electronic Bulletin Board. The standard would also eliminate duplicated data as the data requester, using the Upload of Request for Download dataset can specify a "date after" value and receive only those transactions which were first posted after a data requester specified date and time. This means that even if a transaction may be posted for a duration of time, the data requester need not continually receive such transactions in each subsequent download.

GISB has determined that upon receiving an EDI request from the data requester for capacity release datasets, the transportation service provider would provide downloads of data posted after a data requester specified date and time. These downloads would contain data that was selected from the available information based upon a comparison of the data requester specified date and time and the date and time the information FIRST appeared on the Electronic Bulletin Board.

Specifically the reports would contain data that was posted to the Electronic Bulletin Board the first time and not as long as the information is available on the Electronic Bulletin Board. This would allow the data requester to receive the capacity release data once and not as long as the offer or award is effective. As stated above, this would allow the

---

Attachment 3 to the Executive Committee Minutes of August 13, 1997

Executive Committee Adoption of Triage Group Recommendations on August 13, 1997

Page 6



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas, 77002  
Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email [gisb@aol.com](mailto:gisb@aol.com)  
Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

data requester to receive capacity release data when it is FIRST posted and not while the offers or awards are effective. Any costs associated with this proposed enhancement are minimal. The transportation service provider would use the posted date and time. If the FIRST posting date and time is early than the requested begin date and time, the data would not be sent in the response. The change is minor and little or no testing will be required. Nevertheless, TransCapacity would certainly be willing to undertake testing with any other party.

Triage: Send to BPS to be discussed in the Capacity Release issues.  
Priority: Start by September and conclude by end of year.  
EC Action: The request was found within scope. The actions recommended by the Triage Group was approved by the Executive Committee. The actions approved were that the request be directed to the Business Practices Subcommittee to be discussed with the capacity release issues, with the discussions to begin in September and be resolved by the end of the year.

**Gas Industry Standards Board  
Operating Practice  
MODEL ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT**

THIS ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT (the "Agreement") is made as of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_, by and between \_\_\_\_\_, a \_\_\_\_\_ corporation, with offices at \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, a \_\_\_\_\_ corporation, with offices at \_\_\_\_\_ (collectively, the "parties").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the parties desire to facilitate transactions, reports and other information exchanged ("Transactions") by electronically transmitting and receiving data in agreed formats in substitution for on-line transmittal and/or for conventional paper-based documents; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to assure that such Transactions are not legally invalid or unenforceable as a result of the use of available electronic technologies for the mutual benefit of the parties; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to enter into this Agreement to govern their relationship with respect to computer to computer exchange of information, also known as, electronic data interchange ("EDI") Transactions.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and covenants herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties, intending to be legally bound, hereby agree as follows:

**Section 1. Prerequisites.**

1.1. Documents: Standards. Each party may electronically transmit to or receive from the other party any of the transaction sets listed in the Exhibit(s) of the Appendix, and transaction sets which the parties by written agreement add to the Appendix (collectively "Documents"). Any transmission of data which is not a Document shall have no force or effect between the parties unless justifiably relied upon by the receiving party. All Documents shall be transmitted in accordance with the standards and the published industry guidelines set forth in the Appendix. The Appendix to this Agreement is attached hereto and made a part hereof; the Appendix and Exhibit(s) thereto hereafter are referred to as the "Appendix". In the event of a conflict between the provisions in the body of this Agreement and the Appendix, the

Appendix will govern.

1.2. Third Party Service Providers.

1.2.1. Documents will be transmitted electronically to each party either, as specified in the Appendix, directly or through any third party service provider ("Provider") with which either party may contract. Either party may modify its election to use, not use or change a Provider upon 30 days prior written notice.

1.2.2. Each party shall be responsible for the costs of any Provider with which it contracts, unless otherwise set forth in the Appendix. Unless otherwise stated in the Appendix, the sending party shall pay all costs to get its data to the receiving party's Receipt Computer (below defined) and the receiving party shall pay all costs to retrieve the data.

1.2.3. Each party shall be liable for the acts or omissions of its Provider while transmitting, receiving, storing or handling Documents, or performing related activities, for such party; provided, that if both the parties use the same Provider to effect the transmission and receipt of a Document, the originating party shall be liable for the acts or omissions of such Provider as to such Document. This provision does not limit any claim of a party against a Provider in respect of any act or omission.

1.3. System Operations. Each party, at its own expense, shall provide and maintain the equipment, software, services and testing necessary to effectively and reliably transmit and receive Documents. Any special data retention requirements shall be set forth in the Appendix.

1.4. Security Procedures. Each party shall properly use those security procedures, including those specified in the Appendix, if any, which are reasonably sufficient to ensure that all transmissions of Documents are authorized and to protect its business records and data from improper access.

1.5. Signatures. Each party shall adopt as its signature an electronic identification consisting of symbol(s) or code(s) which are to be affixed to or contained, where required, in the Document transmitted by such party ("Signature Code(s)"). Such Signature Code(s) shall be specified in the Appendix. In such cases where a Signature Code(s) is required for one or more Transaction Set(s), the requirement shall be specified in the Appendix applicable to such Transaction Set(s). Each party agrees that the Signature Code(s) of such party affixed to or contained in any transmitted Document shall be sufficient to verify such party originated such Document(s). Neither party shall disclose to any unauthorized person the Signature Code(s) of the other party.

## **Section 2. Transmissions.**

2.1. Proper Receipt. Documents shall not be deemed to have been properly received, and no Document shall give rise to any obligation, until accessible to the receiving party at such party's Receipt Computer designated in the Appendix. The Receipt Computer shall be defined in the Appendix as the receiving party's electronic mailbox or Uniform Resource Locator ("URL"), which describes the protocols which are needed to access the resources and point to the appropriate Internet locations. Where the parties employ the services of Providers to transmit and receive Documents, the Receipt Computer shall be defined in the Appendix as the receiving party's electronic mailbox or URL provided by the receiving party's Provider.

### 2.2. Verification.

2.2.1. Upon proper receipt of any Document, the receiving party shall promptly and properly transmit a functional acknowledgment in return, unless otherwise specified in the Appendix.

2.2.2. For the purposes of this Agreement, a "functional acknowledgment" means an ASC X.12 Transaction Set 997, which confirms a Document (in the format specified by such acknowledgment) has been received and whether all required portions of the Document are syntactically correct, but which does not confirm the substantive content(s) of the related Document.

2.2.3. By mutual agreement, the parties may designate in the Appendix a "response document" Transaction Set as a substitute for or in addition to an ASC X.12 Transaction Set 997. A "response document" confirms that a Document (in the format specified by such acknowledgment) has been received, and whether all required portions of the Document are syntactically correct, and contains data sent by the receiving party to the sending party in response to the substantive content of the related Document. If the parties designate a response document as a substitute for a functional acknowledgment, the time requirements in the Appendix applicable to functional acknowledgments shall apply to such response documents.

2.2.4. A functional acknowledgment, or a response document that has been designated in the Appendix as a substitute for a functional acknowledgment, shall constitute conclusive evidence a Document has been properly received.

2.2.5. Except as to conditions governed under Section 2.4, in the event the receiving party fails to promptly and properly transmit a functional acknowledgment or response document in return for a properly received Document, where required, the originating party's records of the

contents of the Document shall control.

2.3. Acceptance. If acceptance of a Document is required by the Appendix, any such Document which has been properly received shall not give rise to any obligation unless and until the party initially transmitting such Document has properly received in return an Acceptance Document (as specified in the Appendix).

2.4. Garbled Transmissions. If any transmitted Document is received in an unintelligible or garbled form, the receiving party shall promptly notify the originating party (if identifiable from the received Document) in a reasonable manner. In the absence of such a notice and where a functional acknowledgment or response document has resulted, the originating party's records of the contents of such Document shall control.

2.5. Retransmissions. If the originating party of a Document has not properly received a corresponding functional acknowledgment or response document within the Retransmission Timeframe indicated in the Appendix, the originating party shall retransmit the Document.

### **Section 3. Transaction Terms.**

3.1. Terms and Conditions. This Agreement is to be considered part of any other written agreement referencing it or referenced in the Appendix. In the absence of any other written agreement applicable to any Transaction made pursuant to this Agreement, such Transaction (and any related communication) also shall be subject to [CHOOSE ONE]:

[A] those terms and conditions, including any terms for payment, included in the Appendix.

[B] the terms and conditions included on each party's standard printed applicable forms attached to or identified in the Appendix [as the same may be amended from time to time by either party upon written notice to the other]. The parties acknowledge that the terms and conditions set forth on such forms may be inconsistent, or in conflict, but agree that any conflict or dispute that arises between the parties in connection with any such Transaction will be resolved as if such Transaction had been effected through the use of such forms.

[C] such additional terms and conditions as may be determined in accordance with applicable law.

The terms of this Agreement shall prevail in the event of any conflict with any other terms and conditions applicable to any Transaction. Notwithstanding the foregoing and Section 4.1 of this Agreement, if any party determines that this Agreement is in conflict with either that party's existing tariff or an obligation imposed by a governmental entity exercising jurisdiction

over that party, then the affected party shall give immediate notice defining which terms of this Agreement are affected, and the reasons therefor, and may provide notice of termination of this Agreement as provided in Section 4.7, effective immediately upon receipt of such notice by the other party to this Agreement.

3.2. Confidentiality. No information contained in any Document or otherwise exchanged between the parties shall be considered confidential, except to the extent provided in Section 1.5, by written agreement between the parties, or by applicable law.

**3.3. Validity: Enforceability.**

3.3.1. This Agreement has been executed by the parties to evidence their mutual intent to create binding obligations pursuant to the electronic transmission and receipt of Documents specifying certain of the applicable terms.

3.3.2. Any Document properly transmitted pursuant to this Agreement shall be considered, in connection with any Transaction, any other written agreement described in Section 3.1, or this Agreement, to be a "writing" or "in writing"; and any such Document when containing, or to which there is affixed, a Signature Code ("Signed Documents") shall be deemed for all purposes (a) to have been "signed" and (b) to constitute an "original" when printed from electronic files or records established and maintained in the normal course of business.

3.3.3. The conduct of the parties pursuant to this Agreement, including the use of Signed Documents properly transmitted pursuant to this Agreement, shall, for all legal purposes, evidence a course of dealing and a course of performance accepted by the parties in furtherance of this Agreement, any Transaction and any other written agreement described in Section 3.1.

3.3.4. The parties agree not to contest the validity or enforceability of Signed Documents under the provisions of any applicable law relating to whether certain agreements are to be in writing or signed by the party to be bound thereby. Signed Documents, if introduced as evidence on paper in any judicial, arbitration, mediation or administrative proceedings, will be admissible as between the parties to the same extent and under the same conditions as other business records originated and maintained in documentary form. Neither party shall contest the admissibility of copies of Signed Documents under either the business records exception to the hearsay rule or the best evidence rule on the basis that the Signed Documents were not originated or maintained in documentary form.

**Section 4. Miscellaneous.**

4.1. Term. This Agreement shall be effective as of the date first set forth above and shall

remain in effect until terminated by either party with not less than 30 days prior written notice specifying the effective date of termination; provided, however, that written notice for purposes of this paragraph shall not include notice provided pursuant to an EDI transaction; further provided, however, that any termination shall not affect the respective obligations or rights of the parties arising under any Documents or otherwise under this Agreement prior to the effective date of termination.

4.2. Severability. Any provision of this Agreement which is determined to be invalid or unenforceable will be ineffective to the extent of such determination without invalidating the remaining provisions of this Agreement or affecting the validity or enforceability of such remaining provisions.

4.3. Entire Agreement. This Agreement and the Appendix constitute the complete agreement of the parties relating to the matters specified in this Agreement and supersede all prior representations or agreements, whether oral or written, with respect to such matters. No oral modification or waiver of any of the provisions of this agreement shall be binding on either party. No obligation to enter into any Transaction is to be implied from the execution or delivery of this Agreement. This Agreement is solely for the benefit of, and shall be binding solely upon, the parties their agents and their respective successors and permitted assigns. This Agreement is not intended to benefit and shall not be for the benefit of any party other than the parties hereto and no other party shall have any right, claim or action as a result of this Agreement.

4.4. Governing Law. This Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the state [commonwealth], [province] of \_\_\_\_\_, excluding any conflict-of-law rules and principles of that state [commonwealth] [province] which would result in reference to the laws or law rules of another jurisdiction.

4.5. Force Majeure. No party shall be liable for any failure to perform its obligations in connection with any Transaction or any Document, where such failure results from any act of God or other cause beyond such party's reasonable control (including, without limitation, any mechanical, electronic or communications failure) which prevents such party from transmitting or receiving any documents and which, by the exercise of due diligence, such party is unable to prevent or overcome.

4.6. Exclusion of Certain Damages. Neither party shall be liable to the other for any special, incidental, exemplary or consequential damages arising from or as a result of any delay, omission or error in the electronic transmission or receipt of any Documents pursuant to this Agreement, even if either party has been advised of the possibility of such damages and **REGARDLESS OF FAULT**. Any limitation on direct damages to software and hardware arising from this Agreement shall be set forth in the Appendix.

4.7. Notices. All notices required or permitted to be given with respect to this Agreement shall be given by mailing the same postage prepaid, or given by fax or by courier, or by other methods specified in the Appendix to the addressee party at such party's address as set forth in the Appendix. Either party may change its address for the purpose of notice hereunder by giving the other party no less than five (5) days prior written notice of such new address in accordance with the preceding provisions.

4.8. Assignment. This Agreement may not be assigned or transferred by either party without the prior written approval of the other party, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld; provided, any assignment or transfer, whether by merger or otherwise, to a party's affiliate or successor in interest shall be permitted without prior consent if such party assumes this Agreement.

4.9. Waivers. No forbearance by any party to require performance of any provisions of this Agreement shall constitute or be deemed a waiver of such provision or the right thereafter to enforce it.

4.10. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in any number of original counterparts all of which shall constitute but one and the same instrument.

4.11. Reference Glossary. This section lists each defined term in this Agreement and cross references that term to its definition in the Agreement.

DEFINED TERM	WHERE DEFINED
Agreement	Header
parties	Header
Transactions	Recital
electronic data interchange, EDI	Recital
Documents	Section 1.1
Appendix	Section 1.1
Provider	Section 1.2.1
Signature Code(s)	Section 1.5
Uniform Resource Locator, URL	Section 2.1
Receipt Computer	Section 2.1
functional acknowledgment	Section 2.2.2
response document	Section 2.2.3
Acceptance Document	Section 2.3

Retransmission Timeframe	Section 2.5
Signed Documents	Section 3.3.2
Legal Entity Common Code	Appendix
Electronic Delivery Mechanism	Exhibit I-XXX, Section 1

Each party has caused this Agreement to be properly executed on its behalf as of the date first above written.

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 By: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (DATE)

COMPANY NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
STREET ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE/PROVINCE/COMMONWEALTH \_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP/POSTAL CODE \_\_\_\_\_

ATTENTION \_\_\_\_\_  
(NAME, TITLE)

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ FAX \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER NOTICE METHOD & ADDRESS  
\_\_\_\_\_

LEGAL ENTITY COMMON CODE (D-U-N-S® Number<sup>1</sup>) \_\_\_\_\_  
PROVIDER NAME (If any) \_\_\_\_\_

COMPANY NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
STREET ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE/PROVINCE/COMMONWEALTH \_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP/POSTAL CODE \_\_\_\_\_

ATTENTION \_\_\_\_\_  
(NAME, TITLE)

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ FAX \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER NOTICE METHOD & ADDRESS  
\_\_\_\_\_

LEGAL ENTITY COMMON CODE (D-U-N-S® Number<sup>1</sup>) \_\_\_\_\_  
PROVIDER NAME (If any) \_\_\_\_\_

ALLOCATION OF COSTS:  
Sender: [Pays all costs to get its data to the receiving party's Receipt Computer.]  
Receiver: [Pays all costs to retrieve the data.]

<sup>1</sup> A registered trademark of Dun & Bradstreet Corporation



All Exhibits attached hereto are to be considered attached to the Appendix and made a part thereof. Where there are any provisions specified both in the Exhibit(s) and in the Appendix, those contained in the Exhibit(s) govern.

The undersigned do hereby execute this Appendix, which Appendix is attached to and made a part of the above referenced Trading Partner Agreement. By execution below the parties hereby ratify said Agreement for all purposes set forth in this Appendix and the attached Exhibit(s).

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

PRINTED NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

PRINTED NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT I-XXX (Sequential Number)  
 ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
 DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
 TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
 COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

## 1. DOCUMENT SPECIFIC OPERATING INFORMATION:

(This section covers only the originating Document and its Functional Acknowledgment or identification and timing of substitute Response Document.)

NATURAL GAS DESCRIPTIVE NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
 ASC X12 VERSION/RELEASE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

ELECTRONIC DELIVERY MECHANISM (The method used to electronically transmit transactions, such as those in EDI format, to a trading partner) - INTERNET:

ROW NUM	ITEMS	ORIGINATING PARTY	RECEIVING PARTY
1	COMPANY NAME		
2	EDI CONTACT PHONE NUMBER		
3	PROVIDER NAME (if different from that in the Appendix)		
4	RECEIPT COMPUTER URL (host name or IP address, any non-standard port, directory, program name, as necessary)		
0	Basic Authentication userid		
0	Basic Authentication password		
0	HTTP from/to tag		
5	ISA QUALIFIER		
6	ISA ID CODE		
7	GS ID CODE		
8	FUNCTIONAL 997 DOCUMENT ACKNOWLEDGMENT (FA) (Y/N)	N/A	
9	FA RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
10	RESPONSE DOCUMENT (RSP) NUMBER/NAME	N/A	
11	FUNCTIONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSE	N/A	
12	RSP RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
13	ACCEPTANCE DOCUMENT (ACPT)	N/A	
14	FUNCTIONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCEPTANCE		N/A
15	ACPT RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
16	RETRANSMIT TIME FRAME (ORIGINAL DOCUMENT)		N/A
17	SIGNATURE CODE		

EXHIBIT I-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

2. STANDARDS: Specify all applicable standards and the issuing organizations.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Selected standards include, as applicable, all data dictionaries, segment dictionaries and transmission controls referenced in those standards for the Transaction(s) contained in this Exhibit.

3. INDUSTRY GUIDELINES: Specify all applicable published industry guidelines.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The mutually agreed provisions of this Exhibit shall control in the event of any conflict with any listed industry guidelines.

4. SECURITY PROCEDURES: (Define security procedures, including but not limited to encryption, authentication, and PGP version .)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4.1 PUBLIC ENCRYPTION KEY EXCHANGE PROCEDURES:

a) Contact for public encryption key exchange (emergency and scheduled)

\_\_\_\_\_

b) Method of contact and related information (phone number and/or e-mail address)

\_\_\_\_\_

c) Chosen electronic method of key exchange

\_\_\_\_\_

d) Scheduled public encryption key exchange procedures including frequency

\_\_\_\_\_

e) Emergency public encryption key exchange procedures

\_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT I-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT

DATED \_\_\_\_\_

TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

f) Verification procedures to confirm appropriate exchange of public encryption keys

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

g) Other

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. TERMS AND CONDITIONS: (If no special terms and conditions have been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. DATA RETENTION (If no special data retention procedures have been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. REFERENCED AGREEMENTS: (As required by Section 3.1 of the referenced Agreement. Parties to place a list of type(s) of agreements, as well as language which provides for the incorporation into this Exhibit of all agreements of specified type(s) which are executed subsequent to ratification of this Exhibit.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT I-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

8. LIMITATION ON DIRECT DAMAGES: (If no limitation has been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: (See Section 3.2. If no limitation has been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Is the data element "transaction set" supported in the HTTP envelope (Yes/No)

\_\_\_\_\_

The undersigned do hereby execute this Exhibit pursuant to the Agreement attached and do hereby ratify said Agreement for all purposes set forth in this Exhibit.

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
PRINTED  
NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
PRINTED  
NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT V-XXX (Sequential Number)  
 ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
 DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
 TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
 COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

1. DOCUMENT SPECIFIC OPERATING INFORMATION:

(This section covers only the originating Document and its Functional Acknowledgment or identification and timing of substitute Response Document.)

NATURAL GAS DESCRIPTIVE NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ASC X12 VERSION/RELEASE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

ELECTRONIC DELIVERY MECHANISM (The method used to electronically transmit transactions, such as those in EDI format, to a trading partner) - VAN:

ROW NUM	ITEMS	ORIGINATING PARTY	RECEIVING PARTY
1	COMPANY NAME		
2	EDI CONTACT PHONE NUMBER		
3	PROVIDER NAME (if different from that in the Appendix)		
4	RECEIPT COMPUTER VAN Account ID		
5	ISA QUALIFIER		
6	ISA ID CODE		
7	GS ID CODE		
8	FUNCTIONAL 997 DOCUMENT ACKNOWLEDGMENT (FA) (Y/N)	N/A	
9	FA RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
10	RESPONSE DOCUMENT (RSP) NUMBER/NAME	N/A	
11	FUNCTIONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSE	N/A	
12	RSP RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
13	ACCEPTANCE DOCUMENT (ACPT)	N/A	
14	FUNCTIONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ACCEPTANCE		N/A
15	ACPT RETURN TIME FRAME	N/A	
16	RETRANSMIT TIME FRAME (ORIGINAL DOCUMENT)		N/A
17	SIGNATURE CODE		

EXHIBIT V-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

2. STANDARDS: Specify all applicable standards and the issuing organizations.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Selected standards include, as applicable, all data dictionaries, segment dictionaries and transmission controls referenced in those standards for the Transaction(s) contained in this Exhibit.

3. INDUSTRY GUIDELINES: Specify all applicable published industry guidelines.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The mutually agreed provisions of this Exhibit shall control in the event of any conflict with any listed industry guidelines.

4. SECURITY PROCEDURES: (Define security procedures, including but not limited to encryption, authentication, and PGP version if any.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 4.1 PUBLIC ENCRYPTION KEY EXCHANGE PROCEDURES: (If applicable)

- a) Contact for public encryption key exchange (emergency and scheduled)

\_\_\_\_\_

- b) Method of contact and related information (phone number and/or e-mail address)

\_\_\_\_\_

- c) Chosen electronic method of key exchange

\_\_\_\_\_

- d) Scheduled public encryption key exchange procedures including frequency

\_\_\_\_\_

- e) Emergency public encryption key exchange procedures

\_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT V-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

f) Verification procedures to confirm appropriate exchange of public encryption keys

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

g) Other

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. TERMS AND CONDITIONS: (If no special terms and conditions have been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. DATA RETENTION (If no special data retention procedures have been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. REFERENCED AGREEMENTS: (As required by Section 3.1 of the referenced Agreement. Parties to place a list of type(s) of agreements, as well as language which provides for the incorporation into this Exhibit of all agreements of specified type(s) which are executed subsequent to ratification of this Exhibit.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT V-XXX (Sequential Number)  
ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE TRADING PARTNER AGREEMENT  
DATED \_\_\_\_\_  
TO BE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_ (date)  
COVERING TRANSACTION SET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

8. LIMITATION ON DIRECT DAMAGES: (If no limitation has been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: (See Section 3.2. If no limitation has been agreed upon, enter "None".)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The undersigned do hereby execute this Exhibit pursuant to the Agreement attached and do hereby ratify said Agreement for all purposes set forth in this Exhibit.

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
PRINTED  
NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
PRINTED  
NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE \_\_\_\_\_



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

## 2. PROPOSED STANDARDS AND INTERPRETATIONS

- Nineteen proposed standards, modifications to standards, and interpretations are presented here for discussion and adoption. The votes necessary for adoption are at least 17 votes in favor, with at least 2 votes in favor from each segment.
- The requests and recommended standards and recommended interpretations can be accessed from the GISB home page. The comments on the requests and recommended standards and interpretations will also be available on the GISB home page **no later than September 2, 1997**. The deadline for comments on the proposed standards and interpretations was September 2, 1997.
- A ballot is attached which can be faxed into the GISB office if you are unable to attend the meeting on September 12. If you send in a ballot, you are voting on the recommendations from the task forces regarding the original requests, not the original requests themselves.
- **The Executive Committee is asked to consider the requests, proposed standard and interpretations (subcommittee and task force recommendations), and comments filed for each of the above requests and vote on them at a "17 and 2" level<sup>2</sup>**
- **The Executive Committee members who are not able to attend this meeting, and who have not asked an alternate to vote for them, are asked to complete the attached ballot and forward it to the GISB office no later than September 10.**

---

<sup>2</sup>The "17 and 2" level of voting is required to adopt a standard: at least 17 of the 25 Executive Committee members must vote in the affirmative, and at least two members from each segment defined for the Executive Committee must vote in the affirmative.



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

**2. PROPOSED STANDARD AND INTERPRETATION BALLOT**

- **The following ballot is to be used by those Executive Committee members who cannot attend the September 12 Executive Committee meeting** in Houston, and who do not have an alternate who has been given the responsibility to vote for them. Please note either "in favor" with a check mark, "opposed" with an "X", or "abstain" with an "A" by each request number for each proposed standard or interpretation, referred to by request number. You are voting on the subcommittee/task force recommended proposed standard or interpretation, not the original request.
  
- **The ballot should be returned to the office by September 10. The Fax number of the office is 713-757-2491.**



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

Executive Committee Ballot for the September 12, 1997 Meeting

<u>VOTE</u>	<u>REQ. #</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>REQ. #</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	C96024	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97039
<input type="checkbox"/>	C97011	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97044
<input type="checkbox"/>	R96120	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97050
<input type="checkbox"/>	R96125	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97051
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97006	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97054
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97009-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97055
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97009-2	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97056
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97010	<input type="checkbox"/>	R97057
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97016	<input type="checkbox"/>	C97010
<input type="checkbox"/>	R97029		

Committee Member Signature:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

**3. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS ON NEW REQUESTS**

- A summary of the new requests and the Triage Group recommended direction to the appropriate subcommittee and a recommended priority assigned by the Triage Group will follow shortly. The full requests can be accessed from the GISB Home Page in the "REQUESTS FOR STANDARDS" area. The Triage Group recommendations and discussion can be accessed from the minutes of their meetings, also to be accessed from the GISB Home Page in the "TRIAGE" area.
- The new requests for scope determination are R97111, R97112, and R97113 and any other requests received prior to September 5. **The Executive Committee, through a simple majority vote, should determine for each new request that the request is within scope. If found within scope, the request is then forwarded to the Triage Group for assignment.**
- The Triage Group is composed of the Business Practice Subcommittee chairs -- Greg Lander, Bob Wallenhorst, Norm Walker, Kirt Kleinman and Kristine Mespelli, and is responsible for assigning the request to a subcommittee or task force for development of a proposed standard with a corresponding recommended priority, or recommending to the Executive Committee that action on the request be postponed, or that the Executive Committee has threshold issues to resolve before proceeding.
- The Triage Group recommendations and priorities are for requests R97111 to R97113 and others received before September 5. **In considering the recommendations from the Triage Group, the Executive Committee, through a simple majority vote, should determine the direction of the request to a subcommittee and the priority.**



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

4. ANSI AND DISA ISSUES

- Dennis Holbrook will update the group on the efforts to become a Standards Development Organization (SDO) of ANSI.
- Kim Van Pelt will review the plan and efforts to have codes which are not represented in the X12 standards accepted by DISA for X12 EDI compliance.



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

5. DEFINITIONS TASK FORCE UPDATE

- A representative will update the committee on the progress made by the Definitions Task Force, the procedures used by the task force, and several issues that have been raised during the meetings held. This is a continuation of the discussion held during the Executive Committee meeting on August 13. The discussion can be found in the transcripts and in the draft minutes of August 13.



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

**6. RESOLUTION REGARDING INTERNET "LOOK AND FEEL"  
GROUP**

- Attached is a resolution forwarded by Walker Lowry regarding the scope of activities for the the Internet "Look and Feel" group.
- To adopt the resolution a simple majority vote is required.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925  
Houston, Texas, 77002

Phone - (713) 757-4175, Fax - (713) 757-2491, email [gisb@aol.com](mailto:gisb@aol.com)

---

September 2, 1997

TO: Executive Committee, Posting on the GISB Home Page  
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
RE: Draft Resolution Regarding the Internet "Look and Feel" Team

The attached draft resolution was submitted by Walker Lowry of NrG Information Services, as an Executive Committee alternate, to be considered by the Executive Committee on September 12. The resolution was received by the GISB office on August 27.

cc: Dennis Holbrook  
Laurie Paulson  
Posting on GISB Home Page for access to all GISB members and other interested parties



AUGUST 27, 1997

***DRAFT***  
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES FOR  
THE INTERNET "LOOK AND FEEL" GROUP

Be it resolved that the "Internet Look and Feel" Group is directed to expand its scope to include completion of the development of standards to address all of GISB Standard 4.3.6.



GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD  
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MEETING MATERIALS  
SEPTEMBER 12, 1997

---

7. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS

- Enclosed are the request log for new standards or modifications to existing standards, log for clarifications, and the annual plan for 1997.