

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, Interested Industry Participants
FROM: Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting
DATE: April 6, 2000

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander Chaired the meeting, welcomed the participants and gave the anti-trust advice. The agenda was adopted with a change that the draft minutes of March 30, 2000 would be reviewed at the next meeting when Joyce Phillips was available with the electronic copy.

Agenda for the meeting is:

1. Administrative: Welcome, Antitrust Advice, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda,
2. Review of the question from Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding flowing gas issue for discussion and possible vote. (memo dated 3/31/00)

Text of IR Question Follows:

To: Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs
From: Jim Keisler, Co-Chair—Information Requirements Subcommittee
Subject: Issue Regarding Shipper Imbalance—Zone Identifier
Date: March 31, 2000

At its meeting on March 28-29, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed request R98064 relating to the Shipper Imbalance (2.4.4). In response to that request, the EBB-to-Internet Task Force (EII) told us to add the data elements Delivery Zone and Receipt Zone to the Shipper Imbalance. After adding these data elements, we found that the definition of the existing data element Zone Identifier was in need of review.

Specifically, IR recommends that the definition of the data element Zone Identifier be changed as follows:

The ~~transporter's~~ transportation service provider's identifier for the geographic zone ~~identification~~ in which the imbalance is reported.

Please affirm IR's proposed revision to the definition of the Zone Identifier.

Discussion:

The issues here are: Is this the same ID as that which is about to be used in the Imbalance Trading group. What should there be between the two groups to identify that this report is at the same level as that which has the imbalance traded?

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

Motion: BPS instructs IR to change the definition of the Data Element "Zone Identifier" to "The transporter's transportation service provider's identifier for the geographic zone identification in which the imbalance is reported." as redlined.

Moved by Mark Gracey, seconded by Dale Davis
Passed Unanimously

Motion: BPS requests that EDD inform BPS as to how the Shipper Imbalance Statement and the datasets under development in EDD, having to do with Imbalance Netting and Trading, will enable users of the respective data sets to tie together information with respect to the zone where the imbalance is reported in the respective documents.

Moved by Mark Gracey, seconded by Dale Davis
Passed Unanimously

3. Review of the question from Information Requirements Subcommittee regarding capacity release issue for discussion and possible vote. (memo dated 3/31/00)

Full Text of IR Question Follows:

To: Business Practices Subcommittee Chairs
From: Jim Keisler, Co-Chair—Information Requirements Subcommittee
Subject: Issue Regarding Capacity Release—Bidder Affiliate Indicator
Date: March 31, 2000

At its meeting on March 28-29, 2000, the Information Requirements (IR) subcommittee discussed its assignment from the EBB-to-Internet Task Force (EII) to add EBB usages to the Data Dictionary for Capacity Release. The following issue concerning the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator was raised during that discussion. Could you please consider the question below?

During IR's development of the EBB usages for the Capacity Release data sets, it was determined that the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator could not be implemented on an EBB since no GISB code values are available.

The current EDI/FF implementation cannot be effectively mirrored in an EBB implementation. It provides one ANSI code value to describe four bidder affiliate possibilities. Those possibilities are specified by the location within X12 of that ANSI code. The single existing ANSI code value can not specify the four possibilities in an EBB implementation.

Therefore, IR recommends the addition of the following table to the Code Values Dictionary, for EBB only, for the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator:

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

<u>Code Value Description</u>	<u>Code Value Definition</u>	<u>(Suggested) Code Value</u>
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP [no definition necessary]	TSP	
Bidder is affiliated with the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	RS
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP [no definition necessary] And the Releasing Shipper	Both	
Bidder is affiliated with neither the TSP nor the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	None

In the Offer Upload and the Bid Upload, the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator is Business Conditional. If the TSP requires the submission of the bidder affiliate information, then the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator should be populated on the EBB with one of the four-(4) code values from the preceding table. The data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator is also used within the Offer Download, Bid Download, Award Download, and Offer Upload Notification data sets.

The addition of this table to the Code Values Dictionary does not in any way affect the EDI/FF implementation associated with this data element.

Please affirm IR's proposed EBB implementation for the data element Bidder Affiliate Indicator.

Discussion: What is wrong with using the existing code values? The existing code values indicate the affiliation based upon the position of a value as opposed to the value of the value.

Motion: BPS instructs IR to add the following code value descriptions to the Bidder Affiliate Indicator Data Element for use in the EBB only.

<u>Code Value Description</u>	<u>Code Value Definition</u>	<u>(Suggested) Code Value</u>
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP [no definition necessary]	TSP	
Bidder is affiliated with the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	RS
Bidder is affiliated with the TSP [no definition necessary] And the Releasing Shipper	Both	
Bidder is affiliated with neither the TSP nor the Releasing Shipper	[no definition necessary]	None

Moved by Jim Kiesler, seconded by Randy Young,
Passed Unanimously

3. Subcommittee General Requests for discussion only:

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

R96022B TransCapacity

The intention of the request was to change the wording of the principle 3.1.2 to read "Elements should stay consistent from nominations through invoicing" and for it to remain as a principle.

Discussion: There was no voiced opposition to the wording change for this principle.

The item will be on the next agenda for a vote.

4. Subcommittee Nomination Round 2 Requests for discussion only:

Category 1, Dealt With

- R98018

It was noted that the intention of this request was voted upon by the EC February 10, 2000 as part of request R99041. At the next meeting of the BPS it will be recommended that this request be declined.

- R98029

Description of Request Follows (copied from Request Form):

3. Description of Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

Change the usage and definition of the Transaction Status Code "AE" in the 855 Quick Response transaction set. Currently, the status code "AE" acknowledges the entire transaction set and provides for detail and/or subdetail errors/warnings to be communicated. The status code "AE" also infers that the absence of a line item response equates to an accepted response. The definition of "AE" should change from "Acknowledge – With Exception Detail Only: Error(s) or warning(s) occurred in the transaction. Transaction has been acknowledged. Error(s) and warning(s) follow." to "Acknowledge: Transaction has been acknowledged. All processed line items, i.e. sub-detail, to follow."

4. Use of the Proposed Standard or Enhancement:

The usage of the Transaction Status Code "AE" in the 855 Quick Response transaction set would be utilized to identify the status of the line item nomination rather than the entire transaction set. When the status code "AE" is utilized in the 855 Quick Response transaction set, it will refer to only the data that is present in the transaction set. The inference that an absence of data equates to accepted data will be removed. The "AE" status code will cover responses to line item nominations that are accepted, as well as, those that have errors and/or warnings. Accepted nominations will be identified via the absence of the "PID" line. The "AE" status code will acknowledge the receipt of the transaction but will only correspond to processed nomination data.

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

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

Will eliminate ambiguities that are present when the "AE" status code is used. Will eliminate ambiguities present when determining whether or not to infer that a nomination line item has been processed and is accepted when there is no mention of the nomination line item in the 855 Quick Response transaction set. Will eliminate ambiguities inherent in parties differing implementations of what constitutes a transaction, i.e. a line item versus a transmittal of multiple line items.

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

Any costs associated with this proposed enhancement are extremely small and represent a "one-time" addition of a code value description. The request does not propose to increase the volume of data sent or require any significant additional processing. It involves only the addition of a code value to an existing data element.

7. Description of Any Specific Legal or Other Considerations:

None.

Motion: Change the definition of "AE" from:

"Acknowledge – With Exception Detail Only:- Error(s) or warning(s) occurred in the transaction. Transaction has been acknowledged. Error(s) and warning(s) follow."

to:

"Acknowledge: Transaction has been acknowledged. All processed line items, i.e. sub-detail, to follow."

Discussion: Mr. Lander explained the need for this change was partially due to TSPs sending multiple Nomination Quick Responses which only respond to a portion of the nomination transmittal. Dale Davis asked why someone would send multiple Nomination Quick Responses as a result of differentially processing a nomination transmittal. Why would they break it up? Mr. Lander stated that one reason was that some line items go through different validation processes based upon the Transaction Type. Some times data is required for one transaction type that is not required for another, and other times based upon the type of location nominated to or from, there is a difference in required data. This causes there to be differing levels of validation. One way that this is dealt with is to send line items to different validation routines and when the routine is done to send out the results in a quick response. Changing the AE to the proposed definition permits this implementation. It was also noted that it removed the potential for ambiguity when a line item not present had to be interpreted as accepted.

This item will be on the next agenda

Category 2, Title Transfer Tracking

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

• R96025

• R97019

Not addressed in meeting

6. Next meeting and agenda

Next meeting is April 20, 2000

Administrative,

1) Review and Adopt Draft minutes of 3/30/2000 and 4/7/2000

2) R98018 for discussion and vote

3) R96022B for discussion and vote

4) R98029 for discussion and vote

5) Category 2, Title Transfer Tracking - for discussion only

• A) R96025

• B) R97019

6) Next meeting and agenda

7) Adjourn

7. Adjourn - the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM CCT

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

Meeting Attendees and Voting Record

<u>Segment</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Voting</u>	<u>GISB</u>	<u>Vote1</u>	<u>Vote2</u>	<u>Vote 3</u>
			<u>Member</u>			
Pipelines:						
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	X	X	X	X	X
Betty Barnum	CMS Panhandle Eastern	X	X	X	X	X
Tammy Hopkins	Enron - Northern Natural	X	X	X	X	X
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipelines	X	X	X	X	X
Jim Kiejsler	Williams Gas Pipelines		X			
Twyla Strogon	CNGT	X	X	X	X	X
Karen Gossett	Koch Gateway	X	X	X	X	X
Clancy Aschbrenner	CIG	X	X	X	X	X
Stephanie LeCureaux	ANR Pipeline	X	X	X	X	X
Services:						
Greg Lander	TransCapacity Skipping Stone	X	X	X	X	X
Cynthia Corcoran	Corcoran Law Offices	X	X	X	X	X
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	X	X	X	X	X
Producers:						
End Users						
LDC's						