

# 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 Draft~~ Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting  
**DATE:** April ~~98~~ and ~~109~~, 1999

---

**April 8, 1999**

## **I. Administrative**

Mr. Lander welcomed the participants and gave the anti-trust advice. The agenda was adopted with R97123 moved ahead of AGDT issues. The minutes of April 1, 1999 were adopted with a minor change.

## **II. Review of R97123 (for discussion and vote)**

This request was submitted by National Fuel Gas Distribution. (See the request for further details.) Mr. Scheel stated that he believes National Fuel's proposed solution is contrary to current industry practice, and he questioned whether the request is within GISB's scope, as it may deal with compensation issues. Ms. Hess agreed. Mr. Young believes that holidays are the real problem; that is, some parties observe holidays that are not federal holidays, but he added that most tariffs specify how payments will be treated for holidays.

Because the requester was not participating in the discussion, Ms. Scott moved that BPS discuss the request at a certain time this afternoon. Mr. Griffith seconded. The motion passed unanimously. At that point, Mr. Novak joined the meeting, so discussion continued. It was agreed the motion just passed would be vacated.

Mr. Lander explained to Mr. Novak the options the group had been discussing: (1) decline the request, (2) send the request to the EC for scope reconsideration, (3) address the holiday problem, (4) standardizing the due date for the invoice the day after a holiday, or (5) standardizing the due date as suggested in the request. Mr. Novak stated that his goal is consistency and certainty, and he is flexible regarding the proposed solution. There was more discussion about the options and whether the request is compensation-related.

Mr. Novak moved the following, Mr. Griffith seconded:

### **MOTION:**

Unless otherwise specified in an applicable tariff, general terms and conditions, or contract, the effective due date of an invoice when the due date does not fall upon a Business Day (as defined in GISB Standard 3.2.1) should be the first Business Day following the due date.

### **Discussion:**

Various changes were made to the motion to address concerns.

# 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

## VOTE:

<u>Segment</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Balanced In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Balanced Opposed</u>
LDCs	1	1	0	0
End Users	0	0	0	0
Services	2	2	0	0
Producers	0	0	0	0
Pipelines	6	1.2	4	.8
TOTAL	<del>9</del> 10	4.2	4	.8

## Motion passed.

It was determined that there are no issues in this request for IR to address. The recommendation will be forwarded to the GISB office to be circulated for comment.

## III. AGDT Issues

The group began reviewing the three work papers that were posted for this agenda item. Ms. Davis gave a review of the work of the Allocation Grid Drafting Team. In particular, she noted that several previously defined Business Conditional data elements have been changed to Conditional, and the "Condition" column refers the reader to its corresponding Transaction Type Matrix for ease of use. She noted that two new data elements, PDA Transaction Type Code and Allocation Transaction Type Code, have been added to the PDA and Allocation data sets, which require BPS approval. Mr. Lander stated that BPS also has the power to adjust usages of data elements, if necessary.

Ms. Davis moved the following, Ms. McCain seconded:

## MOTION:

Accept modifications to the Pre-determined Allocation data dictionary (GISB Standard 2.4.1) and the Allocation data dictionary (GISB Standard 2.4.3), along with the corresponding matrices and code values.

## Discussion:

Mr. Scheel asked about the types of transactions and when users will know when to use which items. Ms. Davis responded that the parties that receive PDAs will inform their PDA submitters what is required to be submitted. Mr. Scheel then asked if, as a user on a large number of pipelines, he will have to track 18 different data requirements for PDAs, for example. Mr. Lander responded that there will not be situations where all 18 items would be applicable at once - the matrix represents the "whole universe" of possibilities, but for any given transaction, only a subset of options will apply. Mr. Scheel then asked if he could possibly get 18 different reports from 18 different pipelines. Mr. Lander thought that it was more likely Mr. Scheel could potentially receive four different reports, in light of the resolution of R98011 and R98012. The remaining fourteen are mirror images of each other (receipt and delivery sides).

Ms. Davis pointed out that the charge of AGDT was not to standardize the allocation process. The group was charged with examining all current practices and attempting to modify the

# 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

PDA and Allocation data dictionaries so that all parties can use them, because few parties can use them both today. There were several questions about the matrices which were discussed.

Mr. Scheel asked if some of the issues related to AGDT's work are related to the work that will soon be undertaken in the Confirmation and Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee, and if there are related issues, he asked if this recommendation should be put on hold until confirmations are discussed. Mr. Lander believes that the AGDT's work simply enables practices that may be discussed in the Confirmation and Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee. Mr. Scheel then asked if any of the AGDT work is affected by standardization of confirmations - e.g., if confirmations were standardized, would there be a smaller number of options represented in the matrices. Mr. Lander responded that even if confirmations were standardized, there are still several possible allocation options available to Service Requesters because the allocations are driven by the level of detail submitted in the nomination, not the level of confirmation.

Mr. Scheel requested that the group walk through a couple of detailed examples after lunch so that he could better understand the issues. After lunch, Mr. Lander suggested that the group go through a pathed non-threaded (5R on the AGDT Workpaper 2) and pathed (13 on the AGDT Workpaper 2) allocation at a point. As no one disagreed with this suggestion, Mr. Lander discussed the two examples. The vote was then taken.

## **VOTE:**

<u>Segment</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Balanced In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Balanced Opposed</u>
End Users	0	0	0	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0
Producers	0	0	0	0
Services	3	2	0	0
Pipelines	12	2	0	0

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Scott then moved the following, Mr. Scheel seconded:

## **MOTION:**

### **Instructions to IR:**

When implementing R98011 and R98012 in light of AGDT, provide a means to indicate the role of the PDA submitter in the PDA and the Allocation recipient in the Allocation (for example, Service Requester or Confirming Party). This is not be intended to create choices that are not supported, but rather to clarify.

### **Discussion:**

The motion was modified several times in response to participants' concerns. It was asked whether the motion was intended to create another indicator. Mr. Lander thought this was the intent, but IR would determine if this was appropriate, and if so, how it would work. Mr. LaTour asked if this instruction captures the fact that the PDA submitter may have more than one role. Several noted that yes, it would, since a submitter could only have one role at a time.

**Motion passed.** There was no objection to this motion.

## **Gas Industry Standards Board**

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

Ms. Davis asked if R97087 needs a formal resolution. As a result of the ensuing discussion, Mr. Lander moved and Mr. Keisler seconded the following:

# 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 states that with the acceptance of the AGDT work, R97087 is resolved.

## **Discussion:**

There was discussion about what would happen to R97087 if the AGDT does not pass the EC. If AGDT does not pass the EC, it could come back to BPS and interrupt BPS's current agenda. That is, if the EC does not affirmatively decline R97087, it will still be a viable request that must be dealt with by BPS prior to BPS continuing its current agenda.

**Motion passed.** There was no objection to the motion.

Mr. Lander noted that this concludes this round of flowing gas issues in BPS.

## **IV. Review of R97091 (for discussion and vote)**

Ms. Davis offered the following to satisfy her request, Mr. Keisler seconded:

### **MOTION:**

~~When a payment remittance is required pursuant to GISB Standard 3.3.17, it should be received by the appropriate party within two Business Days of the payment receipt.~~

Ms. Davis explained that the goal of the proposal is to quickly remove any wire transfers from suspense accounts. Her company has customers that submit wires with no payment remittance information and the TSP is unsure of how to apply the payment. Ms. Barnum objected to the requirement to give parties two extra business days to submit payment because it delays her processes by two days. She would prefer to have all of the information at the same time, not two days later. Ms. Davis noted that this proposal will indicate the latest time a company can receive payment remittance detail, because today, there is no time by which the receiver must receive this information, and consequently, some customers never submit any detail.

Ms. Scott asked about GISB Standard 3.3.17. She believes that if a company pays in full, a payment remittance is not required. Others agreed. Mr. Lander stated that if payment remittance is not submitted, the receiving party can apply the funds in whatever manner it chooses. If the payor submits a differing amount without supporting documentation, it is at risk for having payments applied differently than it may have intended. Ms. Hess believes that the proposal under consideration conflicts with 3.3.17, and the group should modify that standard instead. Ms. Scott agreed.

Mr. Scheel asked what problem this proposal is trying to solve. He asked if today, parties are really not submitting payment remittances timely. Several said yes, this is a real problem that happens frequently.

Mr. Young did not think two days is enough for those submitting information via U.S. mail. Others disagreed.

There were discussions about other wording changes to Ms. Davis's proposal. Mr. Lander asked if payment remittance and supporting documentation are the same thing. There were

# 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

varying opinions. Mr. Schisler pointed out that because the standards are voluntary, this proposal is virtually unenforceable.

There was then discussion about whether the group intended to modify existing GISB Standard 3.3.17 or create a new standard. Ms. Davis and Mr. Keisler were agreeable to discussing modifying their motion and considering modifications of 3.3.17.

## **Original motion was withdrawn and replaced with the following:**

### **MOTION:**

#### **Modified 3.3.17**

Party making payment should submit supporting documentation; party receiving payment should apply payment per supporting documentation provided by the paying party; and if payment differs from invoiced amount, remittance detail should be provided with the payment [except when payment is made by electronic funds transfer \(EFT\), in which case, the remittance detail is due within two Business Days of the payment due date.](#)

### **Discussion:**

There were minor modifications made to the motion.

### **VOTE:**

<u>Segment</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Balanced In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Balanced Opposed</u>
End Users	0	0	0	0
LDCs	0	0	0	0
Producers	0	0	0	0
Svcs	1	1	1	1
PLs	9	2	0	0
TOTAL	10	3	1	1

### **Motion passed.**

## **V. Review of C98003, R98003, R98091, and R99001 (for discussion)**

**April 9, 1999**

### **C98003**

The group began reviewing the following documents related to this request: Interpretations Subcommittee minutes from June 19, 1998; BPS minutes from July 23, 1998; BPS minutes from June 25, 1998; BPS minutes from July 2, 1998 and the associated work paper submitted by TransCapacity; and the recommendation to the EC dated June 11, 1998.

Mr. Keisler suggested the group consider re-ordering the requests on this agenda item. It was noted that three out of four of the requests deal with dates on the invoice. After discussion, it was determined that the documentation related to C98003 would be reviewed and then the group would discuss the issues related to all the requests that concern dates.

Mr. Lander offered the following questions about the issue:

## 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 Date/Time

1. Where should it be? One per Service Requester? Per contract? Per "path"? Per line item? Rate?
2. What should the contents be for daily allocating? For monthly allocating? For daily allocations that are rolled up monthly?
3. Should it be associated with nomination level transaction?
4. Should there be an invoice line item key?
5. Should there be multiple Charge Types, Charge Type Rates, and/or Price Tiers per "line number"?

The group refined and added questions to the list during the discussion.

Mr. Lander suggested that the group determine what data elements are at various "levels" on the invoice. The following is a result of those discussions:

"Top" level: Service Requester, TSP, Accounting Period  
"Second" level: Service Requester Contract, Date  
"Third" level: Location Indicator (Mandatory), Locations, Quantity, Unit Price, Amount Due (Mandatory), Line Number (Mandatory), Package ID, Transaction Type (Mandatory), Price Tier, Upstream ID, Downstream ID, Upstream Contract, Downstream Contract, Receipt Zone, Delivery Zone, Accounting Adjustment Method, Charge Indicator (Mandatory)

It was asked whether the group needed to discuss the issue at this level of the detail. Ms. Scott, as the requester, noted that all she wants is to be able to determine where the information that supports the numbers in the invoice can be located. Ms. McNeal suggested that, if the work paper submitted by TransCapacity for the July 2, 1998 meeting satisfies at least part of Ms. Scott's request, the group should start with that work paper. If it is determined that the work paper may ultimately conflict with the other requests being discussed today, the group can always modify the work paper.

There was discussion about whether an indicator is really needed. Several noted that there is a link between the parties' Trading Partner Agreements and the TSP's Implementation Guides that will spell out where the supporting documentation can be found. Ms. Scott does not feel this link is clear enough and she would like to see TSP Implementation Guides spell out this detail. She also clarified that she intends for this information to be provided via computers, not through a manual, paper process. Mr. Young noted that by the time the EDI testing process is complete between trading partners, it should be clear to the Service Requester where the supporting detail can be found, and he did not understand what value an indicator would add. There was further discussion on this issue.

It was suggested that the group re-focus, and examine the requests in order. Concepts from each individual request would be captured without extensive word-smithing and then once the group gets through all the requests, it can fine-tune the proposed solutions. Others agreed with this suggestion.

## 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

Ms. Scott stated that she felt that the work paper from the July 2, 1998 BPS meeting may address several of her concerns. It was suggested that it be captured as a concept. The content of the work paper is:

Where a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) performs daily allocations (without regard to whether the TSP bills on scheduled or allocated) the Beginning Transaction Date/Time and the Ending Transaction Date/Time in the Invoice should be the date/time that a transaction (line item) began (or ended respectively) where such transaction began (or ended respectively) within the subject invoice period. Where the TSP allocates daily and a transaction began prior to the subject invoicing period the Beginning Transaction Date/Time in the Invoice should be the beginning date of the invoicing period. Where the TSP allocates daily and a transaction was continuing as of the end of the subject invoicing period the Ending Transaction Date/Time in the Invoice should be the ending date of the invoicing period.

Where a TSP performs only monthly allocations and bills only on allocated quantities, the Beginning Transaction Date/Time and the Ending Transaction Date/Time are permitted to be the date/time that the subject invoicing period began (or ended respectively). ~~In this instance, the TSP should indicate on the invoice the document to which the Service Requester may refer for documentation supporting the invoice quantities. In the instance where the TSP allocates monthly, invoices on allocated quantities, and defaults the Beginning Transaction Date/Time and Ending Transaction Date/Time to the beginning and ending of the subject invoicing period the TSP should indicate on the invoice the document to which the Service Requester may refer for documentation supporting the invoice quantities. In the instance where the TSP allocates daily, rolls up to monthly for invoicing, and defaults the Beginning Transaction Date/Time and Ending Transaction Date/Time to the beginning and ending of the subject invoicing period, the TSP should indicate on the invoice the document to which the Service Requester may refer for documentation supporting the invoice quantities.~~

\* Note: Beginning and Ending Transaction Date/Time, as used in this concept, represent four data elements: Beginning Transaction Date, Beginning Transaction Time, Ending Transaction Date, and Ending Transaction Time.

Changes were made to the motion to reflect Ms. Barnum's concern that she could not find her company's practice in the proposed standard. She allocates daily, but rolls up the allocations to a monthly quantity.

It was determined that after lunch, the group would discuss R9800391.

After lunch, the question was raised whether Beginning and Ending Transaction Time should remain in the concept. There was some disagreement about whether they should remain, but it was agreed that because this is only a concept, this issue will likely be discussed again at a later date and prior to resolution of the request.

### **R9800391**

This request was submitted by ANR. (See the request for specific details.) Mr. Lander characterized it as a request for add a date to the third level of detail (discussed above) in the invoice in order to reduce the number of loops for each contract. Ms. LeCureaux agreed. Ms. Barnum asked if daily allocating TSPs would have to include the information suggested in the request in each line item on the invoice. Ms. LeCureaux thought yes, they would. Ms.

## **Gas Industry Standards Board**

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

Barnum then asked how paper invoices would be affected by this proposal. Ms. Scott believes that the paper invoice would be unaffected and thus can reflect whatever the TSP wants so long as the paper invoice and EDI invoice are comparable. Ms. Hess asked Ms. LeCureaux if the intent of the request was to avoid re-stating the contract over and over on the invoice. Ms. LeCureaux stated yes, this is the intent. Mr. Keisler did not think this request has any business practice implications - the issue is the level at which the elements are mapped. Based upon the group's previous discussion, he does not think the date needs to be moved. There was more discussion on this point. Ms. Scott suggested that the Technical Subcommittee examine the issues raised. Others agreed.

## 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

### Question to Technical:

How many different occurrences of contract/date level information can be included within an invoice? If there is a limit, what is it?

It was noted that IR could include this answer in the TIBP, which would help resolve this request.

There was no stated objection to sending the question to Technical.

### R99001

Ms. Hess assumed the position of chair so that Mr. Lander could discuss his request.

Mr. Lander explained the intent of the request. (See the request for specific details.) TransCapacity is seeking to include the Nominator Tracking ID at the "third" level (as discussed above) in the invoice when present in the nomination. He suggested the Location Indicator, Locations, Package ID, Transaction Type, Upstream ID, Downstream ID, Upstream Contract, Downstream Contract, Associated Contract, and Capacity Type date elements would be eliminated if the Nominator Tracking ID is sent by the TSP instead. Mr. Lander said the two ways were either to add Nominator's Tracking ID to the invoice or to create a business key for the invoice.

In response to a question, Mr. Lander stated that the intent of the request is to allow the SR to tie information together from the nomination to the invoice. Mr. Keisler had concerns about the request deviating from the original intent of the use of the Nominator Tracking ID. It appears to Mr. Keisler that the element will have to be stored in TSP systems for possibly months, particularly if the element is used in TSP systems through invoicing process. He noted that the element may also be required to be used for prior period adjustments. Mr. Lander stated that this is in fact what is intended by the request.

Mr. Keisler had several other questions for Mr. Lander, which were discussed in detail. One of Mr. Keisler's concerns was with a Service Requester submitting a number of nominations in various cycles on the same day with the same Nominator Tracking ID. Mr. Lander responded that he would not expect to see a separate invoice for each Nominator Tracking ID, but instead there would be one invoice line and the Nominator's Tracking ID for the last transaction sent in for a gas day with the same Nominator Tracking ID would be reflected on the invoice. Ms. Hess did not understand what value this would have. Mr. Lander walked through examples.

Mr. Keisler then suggested that the Nominator Tracking ID should not be used, and instead Service Provider's Activity Code should be used. Mr. Lander agreed that when it is used, this would be acceptable, but it is not always used (it is Mutually Agreeable), and in ~~these~~ cases where it (the Service Provider's Activity Code) is not sent, Mr. Lander ~~he~~ is suggesting that the Nominator Tracking ID ~~sh~~ could be used.

Ms. Barnum noted that she does not support on her invoices the level of detail being discussed, and she is concerned that she will have to make extensive changes to her system should the Nominator Tracking ID be required. If this proposal were made a standard, she does not think that she will be able to roll up the information like she does now. Mr. Lander agreed that it may be necessary to make system changes. There was disagreement about

## 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

what information will be displayed on invoices should this proposal pass. Ms. McNeal asked what the ultimate result is supposed to be - she believes that there could will be much more information displayed on invoices than there is today, and in any event, the information the group is discussing is already available to Service Requesters today. Mr. Lander did not agree that more information will be displayed on the invoice and did not agree that the information is "already available".

Ms. McNeal asked if the conditionality of the data elements listed above would be changed with this request. Mr. Lander stated that yes, they would if a key is created. On the other hand, if the Nominator Tracking ID is used instead, that element will be sent through the invoicing process of the TSP. The data elements listed above would not be sent.

Mr. Keisler noted that there does not appear to be any party present at the meeting suggesting that they wish to see nomination-level detail on the invoice. Mr. Lander disagreed.

Ms. Scott suggested that this discussion may be premature, based upon the fact that R98011 and R98012 have not passed the EC yet. She would prefer to see electronic commerce better established before GISB recommends the use of this type of identifier. She would like to continue to receive paper invoices.

Mr. Griffith noted that the invoice represents the activity that was performed under a contract. It does not necessarily tie to tariff rate schedules or nomination line items. He added that the Nominator Tracking ID is not in common usage. His Service Requesters use those numbers across different TSPs, which is a different usage of the element that is not envisioned in the request. Mr. Lander acknowledged the potential confusion if the Nominator's Tracking ID's are not unique and noted that was why a key for the invoice was another alternative.

Questions to be considered in further discussion on this request:

1. Can discussion of the request continue prior to the resolution of R98011 and R98012?

Assuming the answer to question one is yes:

2. At what level of detail will invoice information be communicated (e.g., at the nomination level)?

Ms. Scott requested that the group briefly discuss some unresolved issues related to R98003. There was no objection to this suggestion.

### **R98003**

Ms. Scott gave an example where a Service Requester has one quantity of gas at one location, but there are multiple rates associated with the quantity. There was discussion about whether this request is really a mapping/technical issue. Most agreed that the current standards do not support multiple rate structures being reflected in the invoice, although today, there are such structures on some TSPs.

## 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

Ms. Scott suggested that perhaps IR should correct the invoice so that multiple rate charges can be supported in the invoice.

Mr. Keisler suggested a "fourth" level of detail be created on the invoice. This level would contain Charge Type (MA), Price Tier (BC), and Charge Type Rate (C, Mandatory if Charge Type is present). This last element would be new, but the existing data elements would maintain their current usage. The first two would be moved out of the "third" level to this new level. Others agreed that this might be a possible solution. Ms. Barnum had concerns about this proposal because her system does not support rates at the "fourth" level of detail. Others noted that TSPs would not be required to support rates at this level if they do not currently. A concern was raised that if only one Charge Type is used, the Unit Price will have to be sent twice according to Mr. Keisler's proposal. Mr. Keisler questioned whether there is any party only using one Charge Type.

Ms. Barnum asked Ms. Scott if the request intended that the invoice reflect point-to-point volumes and corresponding charges. Ms. Scott responded that no, this is not what she intended. She added, however, that this may be possible on some TSP systems. Her intent is to have the invoice reflect situations where a volume of X would be shown on the invoice with a rate of \$Y, and volumes in excess of X would have a rate of \$Z, and both rates and volumes would be reflected on the invoice. Additionally, she reiterated her concern that the information sent via EDI be comparable to the paper invoice; that is, she wants the EDI data set to be as clear as "tiered pricing" she sees in paper invoices today.

Ms. Davis pointed out that there seem to be two "rate" issues: Ms. Scott's issue of having two different transportation rates for a given volume of gas, and Mr. Keisler's issue of having one transportation rate that is made up of a number of components (GRI, ACA, transportation, etc.). There was discussion about whether the Price Tier data element might work for both situations.

### **VI. Discussion of Next Steps, Next Meeting, and Agenda**

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. The next meeting will be Thursday, **April 15 from 2:30 p.m. (central) to 4:30 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

## Meeting Attendees

April 8, 1999

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>GISB Member</b>
<b>Pipelines:</b>		
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	X
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	X
Jim Keisler	Transco	X
Marci McCain	Texas Eastern	X
Bill Griffith	Colorado Interstate Gas	X
Theresa Hess	Enron - Transwestern	X
Mike Schisler	NGPL	X
Mary Sue McNeal	El Paso	X
<del>Mike Culver</del>	<del>Algonquin</del>	<del>X</del>
Stephanie LeCureaux	ANR	X
Dennis LaTour	ANR	X
Betty Barnum	CMS - Panhandle	X
<b>Services:</b>		
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	X
Mark Scheel	Dynegy	X
Donna Scott	Enron Administrative Corp.	X
<b>LDCS:</b>		
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Supply	X

April 9, 1999

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>GISB Member</b>
<b>Pipelines:</b>		
<u>Mark Gracey</u>	<u>Tennessee Gas Pipeline</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Dale Davis</u>	<u>Williams Gas Pipeline</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Jim Keisler</u>	<u>Transco</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Marci McCain</u>	<u>Texas Eastern</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Bill Griffith</u>	<u>Colorado Interstate Gas</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Theresa Hess</u>	<u>Enron - Transwestern</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Mike Schisler</u>	<u>NGPL</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Mary Sue McNeal</u>	<u>El Paso</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Mike Culver</u>	<u>Algonquin</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Stephanie LeCureaux</u>	<u>ANR</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Betty Barnum</u>	<u>CMS - Panhandle</u>	<u>X</u>
<b>Services:</b>		
<u>Greg Lander</u>	<u>TransCapacity</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Donna Scott</u>	<u>Enron Administrative Corp.</u>	<u>X</u>