



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, Producer Segment Vacancy, Diane McVicker (absent) 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: April 29, 1999

I. Administrative

Mr. Lander chaired the meeting. Ms. McQuade read the list of attendees. Mr. Lander gave the antitrust advice. On the agenda, Ms. Van Pelt added a response from Technical Subcommittee on Request No. R98091, (it was included in the April 9 BPS minutes). Request Nos. R98007 and R98008 moved to the top of the list of requests to be addressed. With these changes, the agenda was adopted. The minutes of April 22, 1999 were adopted as final with changes noted both in the meeting and posted prior to the meeting.

II. Review of Requests & Vote on Recommended Standards

Question to Technical Subcommittee (from April 9, 1999 BPS Minutes, Request No. R98091)

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

Ms. Van Pelt reviewed the response from the Technical Subcommittee and will provide a response in writing to this subcommittee. She noted that there are unlimited different occurrences of contract/date level information that can be included on an invoice.

R98007 Request submitted from Columbia Gas.

Request: Add another quantity field to the invoice. This data element would be the Maximum Daily Quantity (MDQ). This data element is used when identifying Capacity Release information on an invoice. It is necessary to identify both the MDQ on the Replacement Shipper's contract and the quantity that was invoiced for released capacity demand charges and credits. The usage would be "Sender's Option" or "Mutually Agreed." This information will allow the payer to check the invoice and ensure that Capacity Releases have been invoiced correctly.

Questions: 1. Is this at the contract or at a lower level – i.e. what information would this be associated with?



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

Mr. Stodola responded that the MDQ is shown with the unit price, dollars, price paid -- it would be placed at the lower level line item. The MDQ could repeat per line item.

2. What would you prefer a usage of SO or MA?

Mr. Stodola preferred the SO usage – it is currently placed on invoices today.

3. Would you be willing to use the term MDTQ instead of MDQ with MDTQ defined as Maximum Daily Transportation Quantity? Or to add a suffix or prefix to indicate transportation?

Mr. Stodola agreed that MDTQ or a suffix such as MDQ-T is appropriate.

4. Would you see this as present in all invoices or just for capacity release related invoices?

Mr. Stodola could see this field being used for other than capacity release; for example, it could be used for over-runs.

Discussion: In printing the invoice, if the MDTQ changes at the contract level, can it be maintained at the higher contract level and printed at the lower line item level? Mr. Lander responded that there are cases where the MDTQ does change at lower levels. It was noted that if a requirement existed to identify to what the MDQ pertains, (the contract and zone or path, as an example), there are several ways to implement this in the data sets as long as the data is maintained at the lowest level.

Mr. Keisler observed that he had not heard a compelling reason why this should be added to the Invoice data set, as this information is available from the tariff. Mr. Stodola noted that his customers prefer that this information stay on the invoice. In some cases, each line item may have a different MDQ and if it is not the contract MDQ, the information cannot otherwise be easily obtained. Mr. Anderson noted that the Charge Type may be used, but it would not show the different quantities. This discussion will be held at the Information Requirements Subcommittee where the implementation will be determined.

Motion: Recommend to Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate the transportation MDQ quantity and the ability to differentiate different types at the line item level, with the presence of transportation MDQ at the sender's option in the Invoice data set.

Action: The motion passed unanimously (voting record in attendee list -- M1).

R98008 Request submitted by Columbia Gas.

Request: Add the data elements Offer Number and Replacement Shipper's Contract Number to the Invoice. These data elements would be used to accurately identify Capacity Release information on an invoice. The Replacement Shipper's Contract Number is used when identifying Capacity Release credits. The Offer Number is used for Capacity Release charges and credits. The usage would be "Sender's Option" or "Mutually Agreed". This information will allow the payer to check the invoice and ensure that Capacity Releases have been invoiced correctly.



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

- Questions: 1. How is this addressed today?
- It is placed today on their paper invoices and they would prefer to have this information available through EDI. EDI invoicing is only done with one customer.
- In response to other questions, Mr. Stodola preferred the SO usage at the lowest level. It is only used in capacity release related line items.
- Motion: Recommend to Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate sending the Offer Number and replacement shipper's contract at the line item level at the sender's option in the Invoice data set.
- Action: The motion passed unanimously (voting record in attendee list -- M2)..
- R97088** Request submitted by Transco.
- Request: Transco proposes that a new data element called Capacity Release Cross Reference Contract be added to the data dictionary for the Invoice dataset (Standard 3.4.1) with usage code Sender's Option (SO). This data element is used in Transco's current invoicing process to tell the releasing party and the replacement party the contract number for other side of the capacity release transaction. When invoicing the replacement shipper, we send the contract from which capacity was released in this data element. When invoicing the releasing shipper, we send the contract to which capacity was released in this data element. Our ability to use this data element in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service.
- We considered the use of the Associated Contract field for communicating this information. However, that idea was rejected, because the Capacity Release Cross Reference Contract is used on a different dataset and for a purpose different from the Associated Contract field. The Associated Contract is used in the Nomination and Scheduled Quantity datasets to indicate an alternate or additional contract number to use when a certain allocation result is obtained. By contrast, the Capacity Release Cross Reference Contract field is used only on the Invoice dataset for demand billing purposes when a capacity release has occurred. Therefore, we believe that the Associated Contract field is not appropriate for communicating this information.
- Discussion: Mr. Keisler noted that as a result of the action taken on Request No. R98008, half of the request has been addressed. Mr. Keisler described the request. Request No. R98008 accommodates sending the replacement shipper's contract to the releasing shipper. Outstanding from Request No. R97088 is the accommodation of sending the releasing shipper's contract to the replacement shipper. The data is at the lowest level and the data should be sent at the sender's option. Both types of contract numbers can be sent on the same invoice, so the information cannot be combined.
- Motion: Recommend to Information Requirements Subcommittee to accommodate sending the Releasing Shipper's Contract Number at the line item level at the sender's option in the Invoice data set.
- Action: The motion passed unanimously, (voting record in attendee list -- M3).
-



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

R97090 Request submitted by Transco.

Request: Transco proposes that the data element Service Requester Contract be added to the data dictionary for the Statement of Account (Standard 3.4.3) dataset with usage code Mutually Agreeable (MA). This data element is currently sent by Transco to identify the contract under which charges on the Statement of Account were incurred. Our ability to use this data element in EDI exchanges is necessary to maintain our current level of service. The data element Service Requester Contract is currently a mandatory data element on the Invoice (Standard 3.4.1) dataset. There should be a means of sending this data element on the Statement of Account as a link to the Invoice. Currently, the only link between the Statement of Account and the Invoice is the Invoice Identifier; the Service Requester Contract is more recognizable than the Invoice Identifier, and therefore serves as a better link between the datasets

Discussion: Mr. Keisler noted that Service Requester Contract is needed to more closely tie the invoice to the Statement of Account, and is more appropriate than the Invoice Identifier as part of the key. Mr. Keisler preferred that the data element have a mutually agreeable usage. Both Ms. Hess and Mr. Stodola expressed concern that this changes the intent of the Statement of Account, and changes the structure of the Statement of Account by adding another level of detail. Mr. Keisler explained that because the invoice and the Service Requester Contract are at the same level in Transco's implementation – it would not add an additional level of detail for them. Ms. Hess reiterated her comment that because they are at the same level, the Invoice Identifier should suffice to tie the invoice to the Statement of Account. As a result of the discussion, Mr. Keisler asked that further discussion and action be deferred to the next BPS meeting.

Action: Delayed until a subsequent BPS meeting

R97094 Request submitted by Transco.

Request: Transco proposes that two (2) data elements be added to the Payment Remittance (Standard 3.4.2) dataset to provide a means of communicating the ABA Number (bank identification code) and the bank account number to which payment was made. These fields should carry a Usage Code of Conditional [C] and be required when the Payment Method Code (new data element, see previous Transco request) indicates that the payment is being made by means of the Automated Clearing House or as a Wire Transfer.

Discussion: Mr. Keisler explained the request. Ms. Hess indicated that the information is static, and asked why it would be included on every remittance statement. Mr. Keisler responded that the information could change and that this would be an easy place to find it. Ms. Hess asked that we wait until next week for further discussion on this request, so that she can investigate.

Action: Delayed until a subsequent BPS meeting.

R98030 Request submitted by Texaco.

Request: Reference is made to the above subject implementation guide which utilizes 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

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: In review of the implementation guide for invoicing, the requester felt that it was noted that sales transactions were not sufficiently covered. Ms. Van Pelt noted that we can either keep the sales/transportation invoice together and make changes to the document, or split the invoice into two parts. Mr. Loesch noted that he recommended that the changes would apply to both the transportation and the sales invoices. Ms. Van Pelt also offered that because of the development of flat files, Technical Subcommittee is considering the addition of an indicator to each data dictionary for the transaction set type – which would accommodate distinguishing sales from transportation.

Mr. Lander summarized the issues:

Issue 1: Should there be a way to distinguish, at the outset, if the invoice is transportation or sales?

Issue 2: Is there a further need to know if the invoice is a credit, debit, or other invoice type (6 are defined for the invoice in the request)?

Issue 3: Should it be implemented at the invoice level or at a lower level of detail so that both debits and credits can appear on the same invoice?

Mr. Loesch noted that we should distinguish between transportation and sales invoices, and the types would apply to both sales and transportation invoices. He added that it should apply at the invoice level. Some companies may send informational invoices (ANR) but others do not (Transco).

Action: Further discussion will be held at the next meeting.

III. Agenda for next meeting

The next meeting, to be held on May 6, from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. central, will review the following requests for discussion and possible vote:

R98091	Submitted by ANR
R97090	Submitted by Transco
R97094	Submitted by Transco
R98030	Submitted by Texaco

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m. central.



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

IV. Meeting Attendees & Voting Record

Name	Company	Email Address	Voting Participant	GISB Member	M 1	M 2	M 3
PIPELINES:							
Mike Culver	Algonquin	Mculver@duke-energy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Erik Anderson	ANR	Erik.anderson@coastalcorp.com	No	Yes			
S. LeCureaux	ANR	Stephanie.lecureaux@coastalcorp.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway	Barnetts@kochind.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Randy Young	Koch Midstream		Yes	Yes	A	Y	Y
Mary Sue McNeal	El Paso Natural Gas	mcnealm@epenergy.com	Yes	Yes	A	A	A
Dayton Poe	El Paso Natural Gas		No	Yes			
Chuck Stodola	Columbia Gas Trans.	Barnetts@kochind.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Kelly Adolf	Williston Basin	Brookr@wbip.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Jim Keisler	Transco	Jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com	Yes	No	Y	Y	Y
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	Dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Theresa Hess	Enron – Transwestern	Thess@enron.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Kim Van Pelt	CMS Energy - Trunkline	Kvanpelt@emsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
Betty Barnum	CMS Energy - Panhandle	Babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
PRODUCERS:							
Don Loesch	Texaco	loescdr@texaco.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
SERVICES:							
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	exec@tcapserv.com	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y
END USERS:							
Valerie Crockett	Tennessee Valley Authority	vjcrockett@tva.gov	Yes	Yes	Y	Y	Y

- Motions: M1 Request No. R98007
 M2 Request No. R98008
 M3 Request No. R97088