



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
PHONE -- (713) 356-0060, FAX -- (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

March 11, 1999

TO: Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) chairs: Greg Lander, Norm Walker, Randy Friedman, Diane McVicker, Terry McRae
Posting on the GISB home page for interested industry participants

FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director

RE: **Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee -- March 11, 1999**

1. Administrative

Greg Lander opened the meeting, welcomed the participants and gave the anti-trust advice. Jim Buccigross called the roll and will take the minutes. The agenda was modified and adopted without objection. The minutes of February 7, 1999 were modified and adopted as final without objection. The minutes of March 5, 1999 were modified and adopted as final without objection.

2. Issues Related to R97111 by Information Requirements Subcommittee to be addressed by the BPS [Item 4 Carry-over from the February 17-19, 1999 Meeting]

Greg opened the discussion of the work paper prepared by TransCapacity and posted for this meeting. The text is as follows:

BPS answer to IR re: R97111 and whether 5.3.10 should be eliminated.

GISB Standard 5.3.10 is the standard which institutes the support for the upload of prearranged deal process. Standard 5.3.A does not address this support. Standard 5.3.A is related to timelines for the submission of uploads of offers (whether pre-arranged or not) in order to make the upload process work within the overall timeline for Capacity Release. Elimination of 5.3.10 was never considered by BPS and should not be done. To do so would eliminate the reference to uploads of *prearranged deals* being supported. As such, a party seeking to submit an upload of prearranged deal (part of which is conveyed via an Offer-type upload) could be told that the receiver is not required to support the upload of pre-arranged deal as there is no standard requiring it. While the data sets enable the same dataset to be used for uploading pre-arranged deals and for uploading offers which are not pre-arranged, the datasets themselves do not require (in the absence of 5.3.10) the receiver to process the value in the indicator field indicating the upload is a pre-arranged deal.

Motion 1: Send this text to IR as BPS's resolution for this issue:
The motion passed unanimously without objection.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
PHONE -- (713) 356-0060, FAX -- (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

3. Transfers from BPS to EII Task Force (Invoicing and Capacity Release Requests)

There were no requests for transfer discussed.

4. Review of the following requests FOR DISCUSSION AND VOTE : R98005, R98001

R98005: Greg reviewed the Work Paper for R98005 submitted by TransCapacity. The workpaper proposed modifications for Standard No.1.3.24 and the proposed modifications were further modified during discussion. The final redlined proposed version of 1.3.24 is displayed below.

There was some discussion regarding the "mutually agreed" language in sections b, c and e regarding who the mutual agreement (if any) was between. Language was added to the originally proposed language to address these issues:

1.3.24 (as modified)

When used, Package ID should be:

- a) supported for nominating and scheduling;
- b) mutually agreed between the applicable parties for allocations and imbalance reporting; ~~ing~~
- c) supported for invoicing (sales and purchase); and,
- d) mutually agreed ~~not required~~ for transport invoicing.

Motion 2: Adopt the above modified language for 1.3.24

The motion passed unanimously.

Note: This will be adopted as the recommendation for R98005. This is in effect declining R98005, however the recommendation will show the above as the "accept as modified recommendation" for R98005.

R98001: There was a workpaper submitted by TransCapacity in support of implementing the intent of R98001. The text is as follows:

Instructions to IR to implement R98001 consistent with R98011 and R98012 standards as adopted by BPS as follows:

Change Associated Contract conditionality in PDA (2.4.1 and 2.4.3) to: Mandatory for Service Requester-provided PDA when such are accepted by TSP and when Associated Contract is present in Service Requester-provided nomination. Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, mandatory for Confirming Party-provided PDA when Associated Contract is present in the Confirmations process between PDA submitting Confirming Party and Allocating Party.

IR priority: Await processing until EC approves the R98011 and R98012 standards.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
PHONE -- (713) 356-0060, FAX -- (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

Greg discussed the workpaper and the intent of the language. There was discussion regarding the current condition of Associated Contract in the datasets and the fact that Associated Contracts are used for at least two different purposes on those transportation service providers that utilize Associated Contract.

Bill Griffith suggested an approach to change the condition in the Pre-determined Allocation (PDA) to MA (mutually agreed). Greg suggested that this item be deferred until we have a representative from the requester (Columbia Gas) on a future conference call. There was no stated objection. This item will be added to the next conference call agenda.

5. Review of the following requests FOR DISCUSSION AND VOTE :

R97119

R97119: Greg suggested that this request be transferred to the Notices Task Force. There was no discussion.

Motion 3: Transfer R97119 to the Notices Task Force.
The motion passed unanimously without objection.

6. Related Requests and Framing of Issues - R97022B

Many on the call indicated that they did not previously believe that we would get this far on the call and there was discussion related to deferring this agenda item. It was agreed that there would be additional future opportunities to bring requests and/or framing issues into discussion.

Related Requests:

Kim Van Pelt then suggested that SONAT's "working interest owner" request (R97043) be added to the discussion. It was also suggested that Transco's "first supplier/last supplier" request (R97048) also be included. There was no disagreement to either of these inclusions.

Framing Issues:

Should we identify a default confirmation level absent mutual agreement to the contrary, or a mandatory confirmation level?

There was a brief discussion on how we got here with R97022B, as it has been a while since this request was last discussed.



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002
PHONE -- (713) 356-0060, FAX -- (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com
Home Page www.gisb.org

7. Next meeting and agenda

The next conference call is scheduled for Thursday March 25, 1999. The agenda will include administrative items and request nos. R98001 and R97022B (work papers should be provided for next conference call)

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:15 Central Time



Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002

PHONE -- (713) 356-0060, FAX -- (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com

Home Page www.gisb.org

IV. Attendees¹

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	Motions ² :		
			<u>No. 1</u> ³	<u>No. 2</u>	<u>No. 3</u> ⁴
SERVICES	Greg Lander	TransCapacity	y		
	Jim Buccigross	National Registry	y		
	Mark Scheel	Dynegy	y		
	Donna Scott	EAS			
PIPELINES	Doug Hahn	PGT NW	y		
	Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	y		
	Sally Turley	EPNG			
	Kelly Adolf	Williston Basin	y		
	Jay Story	PGT NW	nv		
	Mark Gracey	Tennessee	y		
	Theresa Hess	Enron -- Transwestern	y		
	Kim Van Pelt	Duke -- Texas Eastern	y		
	Mary Sue McNeal	El Paso Natural Gas			
	Julie Unruh	Koch Gateway			
	Mike Schisler	NGPL			
	Betty Barnum	Panhandle Eastern	y		
	Bill Griffith	CIG	y		
	Randy Young	Koch Midstream	y		
LDCs	Randy Friedman	Northwest Natural Gas	y		
	Robert McAnally	Northwest Natural Gas	nv		
END USERS					
PRODUCERS					
	Tommie Hartmann	Exxon	y		

¹ The attendees' names which appear in **BOLD** are committee chairs. The others are participants.

² y - affirmative vote, a - abstain, nv - not voting, n - opposing vote, blank - not available

³ No roll call was taken on Motion 1 as there was no stated objection, vote was unanimous.

⁴ No roll call was taken on Motion 3 as there was no stated objection, vote was unanimous.