



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs: Greg Lander, Producer Segment
Vacancy, Diane McVicker, Kim Van Pelt., Robert McNally

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: **Flowing Gas Round 2 Requests Assigned to BPS**

DATE: December 18, 2000

Below are the outstanding requests assigned to the Business Practices Subcommittee to be addressed for Flowing Gas Round 2 issues. The requests and the supporting documentation is also attached (BPS June 3, 1999 minutes for Request R97049, EC April 13, 2000 minutes for Request Nos. R00004 and R00005):

| | | |
|------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Williams Gas Pipeline | R97049 | Add code values to the list of Allocation Type Codes in the Pre-Determined Allocation Dataset and the Allocation Dataset to determine the role of the sender in the multi-level ranking process. |
| Tennessee Gas Pipeline | R00004 | Add a new data element "Limit Type" to the Pre-Determined Allocation Dataset. |
| Tennessee Gas Pipeline | R00005 | Add a new data element "Swing Fuel Option Ind" to the Pre-Determined Allocation Dataset. |

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions

Date of Request: February 15, 1997

R97049

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. (Transco)
2800 Post Oak Blvd.
P O Box 1396
Houston, TX 77251

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax #, Electronic Mailing Address:

Name : Jim Keisler
Title : Sr. Staff Programmer/Analyst
Phone : 713-215-4322
Fax : 713-215-3946
E-mail : Jim.E.Keisler@TGPL.TWC.COM

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Transco proposes that additional code values be added to the list of Allocation Type Codes in the Pre-Determined Allocation (PDA) Data Set and the Allocation Data Set. These code values are used in Transco's current business practice to determine the role that the sending party is playing within the multi-level ranking process. Our ability to use these code values in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service.

Transco needs values to be assigned to the Allocation Type Code for the following type of allocation and levels:

- Multi-Level, Operator
- Multi-Level, Producer

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions

Date of Request: February 15, 1997

- Multi-Level, First Supplier
- Multi-Level, Last Supplier.

Appropriate error messages will need to be developed for the PDA Quick Response. Values for the Allocation Type Codes above will also need to be developed.

4. Use of Proposed Standard or Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

The standard will allow Transco to complete the identification of a gas transaction on the PDA.

5. Description of Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

When this proposed enhancement is incorporated into the Standard, Transco and other pipelines that use a similar multi-level allocation process will be able to identify gas transactions in conformance with current business practices.

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

For companies who already use these code values, the cost to utilize is expected to be minor. For companies who are not using these code values, the cost to implement is expected to be negligible.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None.

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List trading Partners Willing to Test Standards or Enhancement (Corporations and contacts):

Unknown.

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business
Transactions

Date of Request: February 15, 1997

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is In Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

Unknown.

10. Attachments (such as: further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSIX12 mapped transactions:

See R96125 which also addresses the need for additional Allocation Type Codes.

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
Date of Request: March 17, 2000

R00004

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company
1001 Louisiana Street
Houston, TX 77002

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax#, Electronic Mailing Address:

| | | |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name: | Mark Gracey | Dena Copeland |
| Title: | Manager, Business Processes | Senior Analyst, Business Processes |
| Phone: | (713) 420-2466 | (713) 420-4502 |
| Fax: | (713) 420-3294 | (713) 420-3294 |
| E-mail: | GraceyM@EPEnergy.com | CopelandD@EPEnergy.com |

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline requests the addition of a new data element "Limit Type" ("Limit Type") to the Pre-determined Allocation (2.4.1).

4. Use of Proposed Standard of Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

This data element provides increased flexibility for the Limit Value data element. The PDA Preparer can 1) leave the Limit Type data element unpopulated and provide a quantity for the Limit Value data element, or 2) provide a code value for the Limit Type data element and the associated Limit Value data element will be calculated/generated by the Transportation Service Provider's allocation system based upon contractual and/or other data contained within the Transportation Service Provider's system.

5. Description of Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

None

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
 Date of Request: March 17, 2000

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standards or Enhancement (Corporation and contacts):

None at this time

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is in Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

The following Tennessee Gas Pipeline customers are currently using the special options of the swing allocation method, that provide system generated Limit Values based on a specified Limit Type:

- City of Olive Hill
- City of Savannah
- City of Springfield
- Western Kentucky Gas Company

10. Attachments (such as: further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

GISB Pre-determined Allocation

| Business Name Abbreviation | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI/ FF Usage | Condition |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Limit Type (Limit Type) | Information used for the determination of a system generated Limit Value. | TSDG | BC | BC | May be used where the transportation service provider allows the Limit Value to be a system-generated value, based upon contractual and/or other data contained within the transportation service provider's system. |

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Injection Quantity | Indicates that the system generated Limit Value is based on the swing storage contract's Maximum Daily Injection Quantity | I |
| Withdrawal Quantity | Indicates that the system generated Limit Value is based on the swing storage contract's Maximum Daily Withdrawal Quantity | W |

GISB Pre-determined Allocation – Quick Response

Errors and Warnings (Sub-detail)

| Code Value (N902) | Code Value Description |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| EPDQRXXX | Invalid Limit Type |

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
Date of Request: March 17, 2000

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
Date of Request: March 17, 2000

R00005

1. Submitting Entity & Address:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company
1001 Louisiana Street
Houston, TX 77002

2. Contact Person, Phone #, Fax#, Electronic Mailing Address:

| | | |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name: | Mark Gracey | Dena Copeland |
| Title: | Manager, Business Processes | Senior Analyst, Business Processes |
| Phone: | (713) 420-2466 | (713) 420-4502 |
| Fax: | (713) 420-3294 | (713) 420-3294 |
| E-mail: | GraceyM@EPEnergy.com | CopelandD@EPEnergy.com |

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline requests the addition of a new data element "Swing Fuel Option Ind" ("SG Fuel Opt") to the Pre-determined Allocation (2.4.1). This data element enables a special option of the Swing allocation method.

4. Use of Proposed Standard of Enhancement (include how the standard will be used, documentation on the description of the proposed standard, any existing documentation of the proposed standard, and required communication protocols):

Tennessee Gas Pipeline offers the PDA Preparer an additional option when there is a swing storage contract(s) and an OBA at the Location. The "Swing Fuel Option Ind" can be used to designate if the fuel, associated with the swinging to Storage, should be allocated to the storage contract(s) or the OBA.

5. Description of Tangible or Intangible Benefits to the Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

6. Estimate of Incremental Specific Costs to Implement Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

None

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None

8. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is Not Tested Yet, List Trading Partners Willing to Test Standards or Enhancement (Corporation and contacts):

None at this time

Gas Industry Standards Board
Request for Initiation of a GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
or
Enhancement of an Existing GISB Standard for Electronic Business Transactions
Date of Request: March 17, 2000

9. If This Proposed Standard or Enhancement Is in Use, Who are the Trading Partners:

The following Tennessee Gas Pipeline customers have used or are currently using the special storage option of the swing allocation method:

Duke Energy and Marketing, L.L.C.
Olive Hill City of
Western Kentucky Gas Co
Holyoke Gas & Elec Dept City Of
NUI Corporation
Providence Gas Company
City of Savannah

10. Attachments (such as: further detailed proposals, transaction data descriptions, information flows, implementation guides, business process descriptions, examples of ASC ANSI X12 mapped transactions):

GISB Pre-determined Allocation

| Business Name Abbreviation | Definition | Data Group | EBB Usage | EDI/ FF Usage | Condition |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Swing Fuel Option Ind (SG Fuel Opt) | Indicates whether the service requestor contract is allocated the swing fuel quantity, associated with the allocated overflow/ underflow quantity swung to storage. | TSDG | BC | BC | May be used where the transportation service provider allows options for allocating the fuel quantity associated with overflow/underflow quantity swung to storage contracts. |

| Code Value Description | Code Value Definition | Code Value |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Swing Fuel is allocated. | [no definition necessary] | Y |

GISB Pre-determined Allocation – Quick Response

Errors and Warnings (Sub-detail)

| Code Value (N902) | Code Value Description |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| EPDQRXXX | Invalid Swing Fuel Option Ind |



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs: Greg Lander (absent), Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker, Norm Walker (absent), Robert McAnally (absent)
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting

DATE: June 3, 1999

I. Administrative

Ms. McVicker chaired the meeting and welcomed the participants. Mr. Buccigross gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McQuade gave the roll call. In the discussion on the adoption of the agenda, Ms. Davis noted that it was inappropriate that R97049 be placed on this agenda as part of the request should be addressed with R98048 and another part of the request may be addressed through the efforts of AGDT. It should be addressed as originally assigned in BPS-N2. Ms. McQuade advised that the only reason R97049 was on the agenda was to determine if it should be reclassified from being addressed in BPS during the next round of nominations or be addressed in the next round of flowing gas related requests. The agenda was adopted with a reversal of R97049 and R98030. The minutes of May 27, 1999 were adopted as final with changes.

II. Review of Requests & Vote on Recommended Standards

R97049 Request submitted by Transco.

Request: Transco proposes that additional code values be added to the list of Allocation Type Codes in the Pre-Determined Allocation (PDA) Data Set and the Allocation Data Set. These code values are used in Transco's current business practice to determine the role that the sending party is playing within the multi-level ranking process. Our ability to use these code values in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service. Transco needs values to be assigned to the Allocation Type Code for the following type of allocation and levels:

- Multi-Level, Operator
- Multi-Level, Producer
- Multi-Level, First Supplier
- Multi-Level, Last Supplier.

Appropriate error messages will need to be developed for the PDA Quick Response. Values for the Allocation Type Codes above will also need to be developed.

Discussion: In the discussion on the agenda it was determined that R97049 was mis-classified and should be classified as a flowing gas item, (BPS-FG2).



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Action: The motion was made and supported unanimously to reclassify the request as assigned to BPS-FG2.

R98030 Request submitted by Texaco.

Request: Reference is made to the above subject implementation guide which utilizes the consolidated service invoice/statement (transaction set 811) of the ASC X12 standard. The existing GISB Implementation Guide does not include a sample sales invoice and sample ASC X12 transaction for the sales invoice. Texaco Natural Gas Inc is implementing process improvements to send/receive sales invoices in the GISB EDI standards and developed the attached sample sales invoice and ASC X12 mapping for inclusion in the GISB Implementation Guide. In our review of the GISB Implementation Guide, we identified minor enhancements to the guideline to support natural gas sales invoices.

Discussion: Discussion began with the use of memos versus the use of reverse/restate process. Mr. Loesch supported the use of a corrected invoice – sending the original invoice again with the corrected information in the same billing cycle. Mr. Young noted that GISB Standard Nos. 2.3.7 and 2.3.12 indicate that a volume change would require the changes to be reflected as prior period adjustments. This highlights the question of when a correction becomes a prior period adjustment. Mr. Young also noted that with the time lines established for invoicing, it may be difficult to fit in a corrected invoice. While Mr. Loesch explained that in his current business practices, the corrected invoice has the same invoice number as the original invoice, others noted that in their current business practices, the invoices would have different numbers.

Use of the memos would require implementing change processing in the invoicing process. After further discussion, Mr. Loesch agreed to drop the portion of his request on credit and debit memos. Mr. Loesch still needs an indicator to identify the entire invoice as either original or corrected. Several noted that the invoice number could be the same on the corrected invoice – and in those cases, the Previous Invoice Identifier and the Invoice Identifier data elements would have the same value. Mr. Keisler did not support allowing the corrected invoice to have the same value for the Invoice Identifier data element as the original invoice. He noted that his concern was based on the possible manual intervention that may be needed. If used, he supported a change in the usage of the Previous Invoice Identifier from MA to C based on if the invoice was corrected.

Ms. Hess observed that since the Previous Invoice Identifier is in the header segment along with the Invoice Identifier, it is not clear that a separate data element needed to indicate if an invoice is corrected or not. After further discussion, it was noted that we should consider using a different document for sales and purchases versus transportation. GISB uses the 811 document for invoicing as does the telecommunication industry. Other industries use the 810 document. The 811 document allows for multiple levels of detail.

Action: This will be further discussed on June 17 specifically as it relates to whether transportation invoices and sales/purchases invoices should be maintained in the same document, or if the information needs of the two types of invoices are different enough that they warrant separate documents.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

III. Agenda for next meeting

The next meeting, to be held on June 17, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following request for discussion and possible vote on Request Nos. R98030 and prioritization of the next round of requests. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. central.

IV. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

| Name | Company | Email Address | Voting Participant | GISB Member |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| PIPELINES: | | | | |
| Mike Culver | Algonquin | Mwculver@duke-energy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Eric Anderson | ANR | eric.anderson@coastalcorp.com | Yes | Yes |
| Betty Barnum | CMS Energy – Panhandle | Babarnum@cmsenergy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Kim Van Pelt | CMS Energy – Trunkline | kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Mary Sue McNeal | El Paso Natural Gas | mcnealm@epenergy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Theresa Hess | Enron – Northern Border | thess@enron.com | Yes | Yes |
| Hilda Lindley | Enron – FGT | hlindley@enron.com | Yes | Yes |
| Raetta Zadow | Enron – Northern Natural | rzadow@enron.com | Yes | Yes |
| Richard Hanagrif | Enron – Transwestern | rhanagrif@enron.com | Yes | Yes |
| Julie Unruh | Koch Gateway | Unruhj@kochind.com | Yes | Yes |
| Randy Young | Koch Midstream | Young0r@koching.com | Yes | Yes |
| Mark Gracey | Tennessee Gas Pipeline | graceym@epenergy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Hien Duong | Texas Eastern | Htduong@duke-energy.com | Yes | Yes |
| Jim Keisler | Transco | Jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com | Yes | NO |
| Dale Davis | Williams Gas Pipeline | Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com | Yes | Yes |
| PRODUCERS: | | | | |
| Don Loesch | Texaco | Loescdr@texaco.com | Yes | Yes |
| SERVICES: | | | | |
| Jim Buccigross | National Registry of C.R. | legaljb@tcapserv.com | Yes | Yes |
| Meg Healey | | | Yes | NO |
| Donna Scott | Enron Administrative Corp. | Dscott2@ect.enron.com | Yes | Yes |
| END USERS: | | | | |
| Diane McVicker | Salt River Project | Dbmcvick@srpnet.com | Yes | Yes |



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

TO: Executive Committee (EC) Members
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: Final Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting - April 13, 2000

DATE: April 13, 2000

GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD
GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Florida Power and Light, West Palm Beach, Florida
April 13, 2000
FINAL MINUTES

I. Administrative

Mr. Buccigross welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Palm Beach and thanked Ms. Gussow of Florida Power and Light for hosting the meeting. Mr. Costan gave the antitrust advice. The agenda was adopted with the addition of an update on ANSI X12 subcommittee timelines, and the discussion on cross contract ranking was moved up on the agenda. With modifications made during the meeting, the redlined minutes for February 10 were adopted. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting (361-882-9037).

II. New Requests

Ms. Phillips presented the new requests. For R00003, the Triage Subcommittee recommended that the EC find the request in scope and send it to the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) to be addressed in the normal course of addressing nominations requests. The Triage Subcommittee further recommended that request no. R00003 be addressed concurrently with request no. R00006. The EC found request no. R00003 in scope. A subsequent motion was made to find the remaining requests (request nos. R00004, R00005 and R00006) within scope. The EC found that the remaining requests were within scope.

Ms. Hess questioned why request no. R00003 was sent to BPS to be addressed with nominations. The response was that request no. R00003 was recommended to be sent to BPS to be addressed concurrently with request no. R00006 because of the similarities in the code values requested. The Triage Subcommittee also noted that there may be new business practices reflected in the code values noted in both requests, so the two requests should be forwarded to BPS prior to being sent to the Information Requirements Subcommittee (IR). Ms. Hess asked that both requests be sent to Information Requirements Subcommittee but request no. R00006 should be done first. Mr. Scheel noted that GISB should not proliferate code values unless there is an underlying business practice. Mr. Love supported Ms. Hess' request as he viewed this request as a service option issue. Ms. Munson noted that there may be the need for two fields, and as such BPS should review the request. Mr. Keisler noted that IR does not continually add codes without close review and analysis. Mr. Keeler noted a function of code values was to provide flexibility in implementation and as such he supported additional code values to support company specific implementations. Ms. Davis supported Mr. Keisler's comments, and added that if an additional field is needed, IR would send the request back to BPS. Mr. Novak noted that there may be business issues involved as the request could affect more than the company that offered the request. Ms. Phillips noted that the request may



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

address business practice issues of capacity allocations. The vote was taken to send request nos. R00003 and R00006 to BPS to be addressed concurrently in the normal course of addressing nominations requests. The motion carried with 17 affirmative votes and 5 votes in opposition.

Request Nos. R00004 and R00005 were discussed together. The Triage Subcommittee recommended sending the requests to BPS to be addressed in the normal course of addressing flowing gas requests. A motion was made to adopt the triage recommendation, which was adopted through a unanimous vote.

III. Recommendations for Proposed Standards

C99002 In response to a request for interpretation regarding the allowable values for the PID01 field in the three PID segments of the GISB Nomination Quick Response, change the Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2) X12 Mapping: "Sub-detail PID Segment (position 510), element PID01: Modify "S" code value to "X"."

The recommendation was presented by Ms. Breeden. Mr. Love moved that the recommendation be adopted which was seconded by Ms. Phillips. Ms. Breeden noted that there is no interpretation; the request was addressed through the technical mapping. The motion passed unanimously.

R97046 The recommendation is to decline the request to add two definitions to the GISB Business Practice Standards. These definitions are as follows:

1. Transportation is defined as the physical movement of gas through space and/or time.
2. A Transportation Service Provider is defined as an entity which operates physical facilities which facilities accomplish the movement of gas through space and/or time and which entity contracts with others to so move gas not owned by the entity through such facilities.

The recommendation was presented by Ms. Phillips. It was noted during the discussion that FERC defines these terms. Ms. Hess moved that the recommendation be adopted which was seconded by Ms. Davis. Mr. Costan had previously noted that to decline a request is a simple majority vote. The vote to decline the request was called; it passed unanimously. Mr. Costan will write a paper on voting actions on recommendations for standards and standard modifications prior to the next EC meeting.

R98042 No changes are recommended. This request has already been fulfilled by the actions taken on request no. R98057. (Referenced EII Task Force (10/2/98) – Discussion only. EII Task Force (11/4/98) –identified as IR3)

The recommendation was presented by Ms. Phillips. It was noted that the requester supported the determination that the request has been addressed through request no. R98057. Mr. Sappenfield moved that the recommendation be adopted which was seconded by Mr. Caldwell. While Mr. Costan noted that no vote is necessary, there was a discussion on how to take the vote. Mr. Costan added that either a simple majority or a "17/2" vote would be appropriate to adopt the recommendation. Mr. Buccigross noted that to err on the side of



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

caution, a "17/2" vote would be used. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

R98055 Add a code value description to the Transaction Type in the Nomination (1.4.1), Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5), Pre-determined Allocation (2.4.1), Allocation (2.4.3), Shipper Imbalance (2.4.4), and Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1). (Referenced EII Task Force (11/20/98) – identified as IR16)

The recommendation was presented by Ms. Phillips and Mr. Keisler. Mr. Sappenfield moved that the recommendation be adopted which was seconded by Mr. Keeler. There was no discussion. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

R98089 Add a code value description to the Transaction Status Code in the Confirmation Response (1.4.4) to indicate that the entire transaction was rejected due to header level errors. Transaction Status Code will be added pending the approval of R98043. Add the data element 'Validation Code' to the header level of the Confirmation Response (1.4.4). Add five (5) code value descriptions to the Validation Code in the Confirmation Response (1.4.4). Change the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Confirmation Response (1.4.4). (Referenced EII Task Force (12/18/98) – identified as IR34)

The recommendation was presented by Mr. Keisler. He noted that the addition of the data element Transaction Status Code was the subject of request no. R98043 and it failed at the prior EC meeting, so code values need to be removed. He recommended that a motion be made to not accept the recommendation. Ms. Davis moved that the recommendation be declined which was seconded by Ms. Hess. A break was taken so that the motion could be discussed. After the break, Ms. Davis removed her motion. Mr. Caldwell moved that the recommendation be adopted which was seconded by Ms. Hess. The motion failed with all opposed.

Ms. Hess made the following motion which was seconded by Ms. Davis: "Send the following instructions to the Technical Subcommittee: Modify the X12 implementation guide for the Confirmation Response (1.4.4) to remove the ANSI code values for the Acknowledgement Type in the BAK02 element." The vote (simple majority) was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

R99038 Add 'Maximum Rate Indicator' data element to the Nomination. Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.54 to include the new data element. Add two code value descriptions for the new Maximum Rate Indicator data element. Add one warning and two error code value descriptions for the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response. (Referenced EII Task Force (June 22, 1999) – identified as IR54)

Mr. Keisler presented the recommendation. Ms. Davis made the motion which was seconded by Mr. Caldwell to adopt the recommendation. Mr. Novak asked if this recommendation applies only to interruptible transportation -- Is there a broader application for this recommendation based on Order No. 637? It was noted that this question may be addressed in tomorrow's meeting as a separate issue. The motion passed unanimously.

R99046 Modify the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1) to allow multiple Charge Types to be sent for each Line Number. Add a new data element called Charge Type Rate to the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1) at the Charge Type level. Add a new data group called the Charge Type Data Group to the Transportation/Sales



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

Invoice (3.4.1) incorporating the Charge Type and the Charge Type Rate. Change the Technical Interpretation of Business Process for the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1).

Mr. Keisler presented the recommendation. Ms. Davis made the motion to adopt the recommendation which was seconded by Ms. Hess. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

R99047 Add the data element 'Accounting Period' to the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1). Change the Technical Interpretation of Business Process for the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1).

Mr. Keisler presented the recommendation. Ms. Phillips made the motion to adopt the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Keeler. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

R99049 Add data element 'Remit to Party' to the Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice. Modify the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Invoice and the Service Requester Level Charge/Allowance Invoice.

Mr. Keisler presented the recommendation. Mr. Caldwell made the motion to adopt the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Love. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

R99051 Change the usage codes on seven data elements in the Invoice from BC to SO. Change the usage codes on six data elements in the Service Requester Level Charge / Allowance Invoice from BC to SO.

Mr. Keisler presented the recommendation. Ms. Davis made the motion to adopt the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Keeler. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Board Actions

Mr. Buccigross, Mr. Novak and Ms. McQuade reviewed the Board actions taken to date regarding the request from the Coalition of Uniform Business Rules to develop standards for retail gas and electric markets. The discussions with various trade associations and the industry wide meeting results were reviewed. There are two further meetings planned for April 17 and April 24, after which a report will be made to the Board of Directors at its June 8 meeting. The Board resolution, which supported the task force actions to date, was reviewed.

For response to FERC Order No. 637, the Board noted it was a higher priority than the other Annual Plan items and should be added to the Annual Plan. Ms. McQuade explained that the idea is for the E.C. to form an ad hoc task force, chaired by Ms. Corman and Ms. Corcoran. The group would be charged with preparing the plan for presentation to the EC for adoption after which the tasks highlighted on the plan would be given to the appropriate subcommittees for work. Mr. Keeler made the motion, seconded by Mr. Scheel that the Executive Committee establish a subcommittee, Order No. 637 GISB Action Subcommittee, responsible for the identifying and assigning standards development and modifications work necessary to be responsive to FERC Order No. 637. This subcommittee will use a balanced voting procedure. The motion carried unanimously.

[Out of Order - Discussed directly after lunch.] Ms. Hess discussed the publication of the next version of GISB standards. Ms. Hess made the following motion seconded by Ms. Davis: "The next publication of the GISB standards books will be postponed until after the scheduled July



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com

Home Page: www.gisb.org

31 publication date. The new publication date will be determined after the EC reviews the work plan provided by the Order No. 637 GISB Action Subcommittee." The motion passed unanimously.

V. Special Reports

Mr. Caldwell gave the EDM AS2 update. A recommendation on AS2 should be in front of the EC at its next meeting. The subcommittee did not recommend an implementation date but may ask the EC to do so. Draft language in the March 23 EDM subcommittee minutes references this possible instruction: "As a result of recommended changes to the EDM implementation guide for convergence with the "HTTP Transport for Secure EDI" (a.k.a. EDIINT AS2), the EDM subcommittee is recommending to the Executive Committee to consider the issue of an implementation timeline. The EDM subcommittee recognized that the industry trading partners may experience unexpected transition problems if a time line is not developed to outline time periods and deadlines necessary for development, testing and implementation." Mr. Love noted that some companies have no choice on an implementation timeline, which is determined through regulatory action.

For the XML Subcommittee, Mr. Buccigross described this week's XML Subcommittee meeting, which was chaired by Bill Hunsicker. A report from the XML Subcommittee is expected for the August EC meeting. The report should offer information to the Executive Committee regarding whether we should undertake XML standards for our transactions. The previous XML work paper is posted under the Future Technology Task Force (FTTF) and will be cited on the XML Subcommittee page as a historical document. Critical dates for the subcommittee were reviewed - May 8 for submittals of report sections and a May 15 drafting meeting.

For the Expedited Data Development Subcommittee (EDD), Ms. Hess described the first meeting of EDD and that excellent progress made. Preliminary data dictionaries for imbalance netting and trading have been sent to the Technical Subcommittee. The next meeting is scheduled for May 9 and 10. On May 4, the Imbalance Subcommittee conference call is to be held to respond to EDD questions. The questions that EDD sent to the EBB Internet Implementation Subcommittee (EII) on data groups and ordering of data elements will be directed to the Imbalance Subcommittee. A motion was made by Ms. Hess and seconded by Mr. Caldwell to this affect, which passed unanimously.

For the ANSI Compliance Team, Ms. Breeden reviewed the timeline provided in the meeting materials. She brought attention to the tasks where the ANSI Compliance Team is making changes to the Nomination, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operator transactions to use the new ANSI 873 document. These changes should be presented at the next EC meeting. While a new map for each transaction is required in order to use the 873 document, the hierarchical structure of the data remains the same. The ANSI Compliance Team was thanked for its efforts in ANSI and DISA to establish the 873 and 874 documents.

[Break taken for lunch.]

VI. Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking

Mr. Scheel explained that, during his conversations with the FERC, they indicated that more information is needed regarding confirmations and cross contract ranking (CXKR). Similar to intraday nominations, where standards were sent to the FERC with a blank in the standards showing a clear need for a policy call, Mr. Scheel noted that the policy call needs to be made by the FERC. He added that this information should be contained in a supplemental report - indicating the need for FERC assistance before going forward. Mr. Scheel noted three



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

polarization issues, which could not be resolved (S1, S2 and S3).

Mr. Keeler noted that in response to Order No. 587-G, GISB undertook this effort. He added that a supplemental report should be filed by GISB with the FERC, stating that we cannot proceed further on CXKR without FERC guidance on S1, S2 and S3 (the subject standards as defined in the November 1999 EC minutes are provided in these minutes for information purposes):

S1 Proposed Standard 1

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, the standard level of confirmation should be entity to entity.

S2 Amended Revised Proposed Standard 2

As part of the confirmation and scheduling process upon request, the TSP should make available, via EBB/EDM, supplemental information obtained during or derived from the nomination process. Such supplemental information, if available, should include the TSP's Service Requester Contract and, based upon the TSP's business practice may also, on a mutually agreeable basis, include 1) a derivable indicator characterizing the type of contract and service being provided, 2) Downstream Contract Identifier and/or 3) Service Requester's Package ID.

S3 Proposed Standard 3

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary between the TSP and the Operator for confirmations at a production location, the TSP should support the fact that the operator will confirm with the TSP to only the upstream entity level. These upstream entities should either confirm or nominate (at the TSP's determination) at an entity level with the TSP.

Ms. Chezar and Mr. Caldwell noted that the package of CXKR standards have not been voted out by the EC with blanks in the language -which was the result of the EC vote taken on intraday nominations. Ms. McVicker and Mr. Novak responded that this type of vote cannot be taken because all the parts are integral for consideration - they cannot be taken in pieces. There was concern that any subsequent report would be a form of advocacy. Similarly there was concern that the report filed with the Commission may imply that the industry does not want confirmations and cross contract ranking. Some noted that they did not have interest in standards for confirmations and cross contract ranking. Others noted that they expected FERC to make some calls on these issues when the EC failed to adopt the work of the subcommittee.

Mr. Scheel made the motion, seconded by Mr. Keeler that: "GISB will file supplemental report with the FERC indicating that without FERC direction on unresolved policy issues no further progress can be made on Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking."

The motion passed with 15 in favor, 7 opposed and 2 abstaining.

Mr. Keeler made the motion, seconded by Mr. Scheel that the communication with the FERC be:

"In Order No. 587-G, the Commission indicated that GISB should consider the development of standards addressing cross contract ranking. GISB has attempted to do so, but was unable to achieve industry consensus on a common set of standards. The inability to achieve consensus was due to disagreement on certain policy issues, as evidenced by the report previously submitted to the Commission in this regard (filed with the Commission on xxxxx). If the Commission expects GISB to further consider a set of standards addressing Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking, it should provide GISB with guidance on these policy issues."



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

The Editorial Review Board will have final approval on communications with the FERC.

The motion passed with the resulting vote of 18 in favor, 5 opposed, 1 abstention.

VII. 2000 Annual Plan

For the BPS, they are beginning requests on nominations related issues and have recently completed the capacity release related issues. For IR, the changes to the capacity release data dictionaries to incorporate EBB usages are complete and the subcommittee is now working on requests related to the Shipper Imbalance. For the Technical Subcommittee, there is no backlog, and they will work on IR and EDD requests as received. The ANSI Compliance Team report has already been given. The FTTF is working on an interoperability survey. The Contracts Subcommittee will hold its first meeting on April 24. There is an Order 637 task force meeting tomorrow.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

IX. Attendance and Voting Record

| Executive Committee | Segment | Present | Member |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------------------|
| | End Users | ✓ | Joel Greene for the vacancy |
| | | ✓ | Kelly Daly |
| | | ✓ | Dona Gussow |
| | | ✓ | Diane McVicker |
| | | ✓ | Tina Patton |
| | LDCs | ✓ | Dolores Chezar |
| | | ✓ | Chris Maturo |
| | | ✓ | Mike Novak |
| | | ✓ | Bob Betonte |
| | | | Steve Sullivan |
| | Pipelines | ✓ | Bill Griffith |
| | | ✓ | Dale Davis |
| | | ✓ | Paul Love |
| | | ✓ | Theresa Hess for Kim Van Pelt |
| | | ✓ | Mark Gracey |
| | Producers | ✓ | Paul Keeler |
| | | ✓ | Joyce Phillips |
| | | ✓ | Mike Johnson |
| | | ✓ | Richard Smith |
| | | ✓ | Scott Brown for the vacancy |
| | Services | ✓ | Jim Buccigross |
| | | ✓ | Carl Caldwell |
| | | ✓ | Keith Sappenfield |
| | | ✓ | Mark Scheel |
| | | ✓ | Sylvia Munson |
| Administrative: | Rae McQuade | | - Executive Director |
| | JoAnn Garcia | | - GISB Staff |
| | Veronica Thomason | | - GISB Staff |
| | Jay Costan | | - GISB General Counsel |
| | Jane Copeland | | - Ak/Ret Reporting |
| | Laurie Paulson | | - Hoffman-Paulson |



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

Voting Record

| Member | C99002 | R97046 | R98042 | R98055 | R98089 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Mark Gracey | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Paul Love | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bill Griffith | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Theresa Hess | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dale Davis | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Chris Maturo | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dolores Chezar | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bob Betonte | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mike Novak | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Keith Sappenfield | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Carl Caldwell | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Sylvia Munson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mark Scheel | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Jim Buccigross | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Scott Brown | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Joyce Phillips | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Paul Keeler | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Richard Smith | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mike Johnson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Joel Greene | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Kelly Daly | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Tina Patterson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Diane McVicker | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dona Gussow | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Total Votes For | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Total Votes Against | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ratification? | yes | no | yes | yes | no |
| Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

Voting Record Continued

| Member | R99038 | R99046 | R99047 | R99049 | R99051 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Mark Gracey | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Paul Love | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bill Griffith | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Theresa Hess | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dale Davis | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Chris Maturo | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dolores Chezar | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bob Betonte | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mike Novak | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Keith Sappenfield | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Carl Caldwell | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Sylvia Munson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mark Scheel | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Jim Buccigross | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Scott Brown | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Joyce Phillips | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Paul Keeler | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Richard Smith | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mike Johnson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Joel Greene | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Kelly Daly | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Tina Patterson | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Diane McVicker | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Dona Gussow | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Total Votes For | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Total Votes Against | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ratification? | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Pass/Fail | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass |



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: gisb@aol.com
Home Page: www.gisb.org

Observers to the Meeting - April 13, 2000:

| Name | Company | GISB Member |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------|
| PIPELINES: | | |
| Dennis LaTour | ANR Pipeline | Yes |
| Joe Bianchi | ANR Pipeline | Yes |
| Pearl Muller | El Paso Natural Gas | Yes |
| Bill Grygar | Panhandle Eastern | Yes |
| Prince McDougal | Southern Natural Gas | Yes |
| Denise Breeden | Tennessee Gas Pipeline | Yes |
| Jim Keisler | Williams Gas Pipeline | Yes |
| Kurt Link | Williston Basin Interstate | Yes |
| LDCs: | | |
| Mike Shahan | Dominion Resources - Peoples Natural Gas | Yes |
| SERVICES: | | |
| Cynthia Corcoran | Corcoran Law Offices | Yes |
| Pete Whatley | Dynegy Marketing and Trade | Yes |
| Leigh Spangler | Latitude Technology | Yes |
| END USERS | | |
| Veronica Jones | Defense Energy Support Center | Yes |
| ASSOCIATIONS: | | |
| Miriam Arnaout | AGA | |